ohn Gunther George V. Denny

incent Sheean Rupert Hughes Hendrik Van Loon 25¢

CURRENT HISTORY

THOMAS E. DEWEY

CURRENT HISTORY'S
25th ANNIVERSARY 1914-193

LOOKING FORWARD TO 1940: at home and abroad
war, in peace; in the arts, religion, politics and

MAJ. ERNEST DUPUY—CARLETON BEALS—LEONARD
SHELBY DAVIS—MILES VAUGHN

A NATION UNITED BY TELEPHONE

JUST twenty-five years ago, on January 25, 1915, the first transcontinental telephone call was made. East and West were united in dramatic ceremony.

President Wilson talked from the White House across the country, testifying to the nation's pride "that this vital cord should have been stretched across America as a sample of our energy and enterprise."

The inventor of the telephone, Alexander Graham Bell, in New York, repeated across the continent to San Francisco the first words ever heard over a telephone—"Mr. Watson, come here, I want you"—to the same Thomas A. Watson who had heard them in the garret workshop in Boston in 1876.

That ceremony ushered in transcontinental service twenty-five years ago. At that time it cost $20.70 to call San Francisco from New York. Now it costs $6.50 for a station-to-station call and only $4.25 after seven in the evening and all day Sunday.

In 1915 it took about half an hour, on the average, to make a connection. Now most calls are put through without hanging up.

These are measures of progress in the never-ending effort of the Bell System to give faster, clearer, more useful and courteous service to the people of the United States.

• • •

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

Ten Important Books of Non-Fiction in 1939

NORMAN COUSINS

THE fourth annual selection by CURRENT HISTORY'S Literary Advisory Board of the "Ten Important Non-Fiction Books" finds these titles on the list for 1939:

The Revolution of Nihilism, by Hermann Rauschning (Alliance):

Abraham Lincoln: The War Years, by Carl Sandburg (Harcourt, Brace);

Thoreau, by Henry Seidel Canby (Houghton Mifflin);

America in Midpassage, by Charles A. and Mary R. Beard (Macmillan):

The Life of Greece, by Will Durant (Simon and Schuster);

Propaganda for War, by H. C. Peterson (University of Oklahoma Press);

Inside Asia, by John Gunther (Harpers);

Days of Our Years, by Pierre van Paassen (Hillman, Curl);

Union Now, by Clarence Streit (Harpers);

Wind, Sand and Stars, by Antoine de St. Exupery (Reynal and Hitchcock).

THE selection of the ten important non-fiction books of 1939 was made by CURRENT HISTORY'S Literary Advisory Board, the members of which are:

HENRY SEIDEL CANBY, former editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*.

JOHN DEWEY, educator and philosopher.

AMY LOVEMAN, associate editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*.

BURTON RASCOE, literary critic and author of *Titans of Literature* and *Before I Forget*.

DOROTHY THOMPSON, political commentator, writer, lecturer.

JOHN W. WITHERS, Former Dean of the School of Education, New York University.

CARL VAN DOREN, literary critic, author of *Benjamin Franklin*, Pulitzer Prize Winner for Biography, 1939.

Like its predecessors, the 1939 list stresses books which give promise of enduring importance. *The Revolution of Nihilism*, for example, has provided thousands of Americans—not only through the book itself but through extracts and condensations—with a clear insight into the true nature of Nazism and the Nazi state. Clarence Streit's *Union Now* has given birth to an active movement supporting his idea for a federal union of democracies. And certainly no biography of recent years has given as much promise of permanence as Carl Sandburg's *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*. Also on the list is Henry Seidel Canby's definitive biography of Thoreau, which may share the Pulitzer Prize for biography with *Abraham Lincoln: The War Years*. And as part of the *Rise of American Civilization*, *America in Midpassage* will become a standard American history for generations to come.

CURRENT HISTORY'S purpose in sponsoring the annual selections is to give greater emphasis to non-fiction literature of definite merit. While it is not the intention of the editors to minimize in any way the importance of fiction, it is their hope that the selections may help increase general interest in worthwhile non-fiction books.

Members of the board, who include authorities in the fields of education, literature, history, philosophy, and current events, submit their selections separately. So great has been the agreement on these individual ballots that only sixteen titles were nominated out of a possible total of seventy titles, or ten titles to each member of the board. Each book on the current list has received four or more—or a majority—of votes. Two books, however, came lose to tying for a place among the first ten: Peter Drucker's *The End of Economic Man*,

and Simeon Strunsky's *The Great Tradition.*

The editors are pleased to welcome a new judge to its Literary Advisory Board, Carl Van Doren, writer and critic, whose *Benjamin Franklin* won last year's Pulitzer Prize award for biography as well as a place among the ten important books of 1938 as selected by CURRENT HISTORY'S board. The editors also take particular pride in the selection of Dr. Canby's *Thoreau.* They do not feel that *Thoreau* should have been disqualified solely on the ground that its author was a member of the board. By any standard, the book was among the year's best and was so judged by every member of the board except its author.

John Gunther, with *Inside Asia,* is the first author to become a repeat winner in CURRENT HISTORY'S selections. His *Inside Europe,* still a strong non-fiction favorite, was one of the titles on the 1936 list. It is also interesting to note that Harper and Brothers, publishers of *Inside Asia* and *Inside Europe,* is the only house to place more than one book on each of the four lists since the annual selections began. The Harper imprint on the 1939 list, in addition to *Inside Asia,* appears on Clarence Streit's *Union Now.*

Begun modestly four years ago, these annual selections, the editors are proud to note, have taken on increasing importance. Each of three major networks carried an announcement of the list last year; one of them described the choices by the board as second in importance only to the Pulitzer Prize. Hundreds of letters have been received by CURRENT HISTORY commenting on the list. Many bookstores have made special counter or window displays. A few months ago an article in *Publishers' Weekly,* in discussing the growth of CURRENT HISTORY'S non-fiction book review section, noted the importance of the annual selections.

As in previous years, authors and publishers of books on the list will receive engraved scrolls. The presentation will be made following a radio program devoted to the selections.

Brief comments on each book follow:

America in Midpassage

In *America in Midpassage,* Charles A. and Mary R. Beard continue their study of America begun in their two-volume, monumental *Rise of American Civilization.* It is a well-rounded, full-view account of what has been happening in this country during the last decade, integrating the five main strands of our recent history into a single, meaningful pattern. Thus developments in politics, economics, culture, science and social progress—each bearing a relationship to the others—are discussed and evaluated.

The Beards are sharply critical of many aspects of our recent development but find much, on the whole, that is hopeful. They conclude that we have been experiencing a "midpassage"—a period in which we have had occasion to re-examine our heritage, and in which we have become conscious of the positive values of our democratic institutions. "It took the great economic depression, the domestic conflict, the rise of Hitler . . . to arouse what appeared to be a fierce affection for democracy and to produce a tumult of praise for the idea and its institutional embodiments."

America in Midpassage is a remarkable accomplishment—probably the most remarkable accomplishment in history-writing in many months—for the picture Charles and Mary Beard have drawn suffers not in the least from lack of what is amorphously known as the "historical perspective." Indeed, the immediacy of their story has its advantages: all the strong colors of current history which usually fade into distant grays when viewed from a distance of years are kept brightly alive. The writing is crisp and forceful.

Abraham Lincoln: The War Years

For the greater part of twenty years Carl Sandburg has occupied himself with a monumental undertaking, the complete, definitive life of Abraham Lincoln. *The Prairie Years,* covering Lincoln's early life, constituted the first half of the biography. *The War Years,* in four inspiring volumes, completes the chronicle. It represents the fulfillment of one of the most ambitious biographical efforts in the English language.

For material, Sandburg took his "guitar and a program of songs and readings, traveling from coast to coast a dozen times in the last twenty years." He met "sons and daughters of many of the leading players in the terrific drama of the Eighteen Sixties." He realized the truth of the old axiom: "Tell me the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws." He talked to them, came to

know them, examined documents, letters, old photographs, newspaper clippings. From them he learned not only about Lincoln but about the people of the times and the experiences they shared.

Carl Sandburg's work is as much the biography of a nation in a vital stage of its history as it is of one of its greatest presidents. For the times and the man were one. Lincoln was a symbol of the times as well as its most dramatic figure.

Only a poet such as Sandburg could have written a work as finely-etched, as sensitive as this. That it will be awarded the Pulitzer Prize for biography is a foregone conclusion.

Thoreau

Those who have read and enjoyed Van Wyck Brooks' *Flowering of New England,* particularly his chapter on Henry David Thoreau, will be anxious to read Henry Seidel Canby's biography of Walden's First Citizen. For Dr. Canby has written a work which does for Thoreau what Van Wyck Brooks did for the entire New England literary horizon. Thoreau, says Dr. Canby, is "one of the typical Americans" of the early middle nineteenth century. His "eccentricity was to keep out of the greeds, the brawls, the current enthusiasms, and the blind strenuosities of his time, and his very obstinacy, helped by his genius, made him one of the best historians of the American mind in conflict." He found his nourishment, his inspiration in nature, declaring that it provided "its own composition, better than the best efforts of art."

Thoreau's works, says Dr. Canby, have an almost surprising timeliness. His ideas of personal independence, moreover, are of strong value today. "Thoreau was able to live without utilities in a hut in the woods . . . Thoreau's stand was for himself, on his own Concord soil. . . . Although no political party will ever adopt his program of self-searching individualism, no private man, determined to keep the essentials of freedom, can afford to be ignorant of this armor against the tyranny of the state."

Propaganda for War

H. C. Peterson, associate professor of history at the University of Oklahoma, wrote *Propaganda for War* as the result of years of investigation and research. He knew, broadly speaking, that foreign governments had elaborate propaganda machinery

January 1940

Twenty-fifth Anniversary Issue
"Looking Forward to 1940"

I. The Future of Europe . . . . *Vincent Sheean* 13
II. Military Strategy and Tactics . . . . *Major Leonard Nason* 16
III. Daladier: Premier of France . . . . *John Gunther* 19
IV. The Sino-Japanese Front . . . . *Miles Vaughn* 22
V. Latin America and the War . . . . *Carleton Beals* 25
VI. American Politics in High Gear . . . . . *Lindsay Rogers* 28
VII. Democracy on the Defensive . . . . *George V. Denny, Jr.* 31
VIII. Our New Arms Program . . . . . *Major R. Ernest Dupuy* 33
IX. Thomas E. Dewey of New York . . . . . *Rupert Hughes* 35
X. Business Faces the Forties . . . . . *Shelby Cullom Davis* 39
XI. The War and the Arts . . . . . *Hendrik Willem van Loon* 42

HISTORY IN THE MAKING 7
G.E.'s New Chairman . . . . *Gordon Hamilton* 10
Russia's Molotov . . . . *Robert Strausz-Hupé* 12

THEY SAY 46

CHRONOLOGY 55

TEN IMPORTANT BOOKS OF NON-FICTION IN 1939 1

COVER PHOTOGRAPH BY WIDE WORLD

• ◦ •

Current History, Volume LI, No. 5, January, 1940. Whole No 302. Published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. E. Trevor Hill, President; John T Hackett, Vice-President; Anne Roane, Secretary; I Harvey Williams, Treasurer John A. Curtis, Advertising Manager. 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Canada, Central and South America and Spain; elsewhere $1 25 a year additional. Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned. Entered as second-class matter September 28, 1935, at the postoffice at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass. Entered in Canada as second-class matter.

in active operation in this country during the World War; what he wanted were original documents, source material which would show just how this machinery operated, how well it was oiled, who pulled the levers, what were the results. Year after year he gathered material; isolated documents were accumulated which had no individual significance but which took on a different complexion when examined collectively; people were interviewed. Finally, he felt he had ample evidence for an indictment in book form.

Mr. Peterson's book, despite the fact that it was published by a university press lacking the advertising resources of a commercial press, has become widely quoted and has exercised a not inconsiderable influence in the capital. One Washington columnist declared that Senators were reading the book to learn about the propaganda which led us into the last war and which may lead us in again. Burton Rascoe, one of the members of CURRENT HISTORY'S Literary Advisory Board, declared it "one of the most important, also one of the most enthralling books of our time."

Inside Asia

Asia has finally been Guntherized with all the trimmings, and a great many people who all along never bothered to read news dispatches under Vladivostok, Manila, Delhi, Teheran, Chungking, or even Shanghai and Tokyo news datelines will suddenly become aware that a continent—and an important one at that—exists on the other side of the Pacific Ocean, that much of what happens in the Far East concerns us as vitally as events in Europe.

Inside Asia follows the pattern of its famous predecessor, *Inside Europe*. Gunther has constructed his story with personalities as the center, politics as the radii and events as the circumference. He ranges from one end of the continent to the other, interviewing leading personalities, reporting, analyzing, interpreting. He has succeeded in dramatizing the essential, the interesting things about a country, its people, and its leaders. *Inside Asia* is as much a tribute to his insatiable curiosity and desire to carve down to the meat of matters as it is to his ability to write so colorfully.

His personality sketches—quite aside from their importance as current history—are literary masterpieces. Impressions are clear, forceful, dramatic. Gunther realizes that people are as interested in leaders as in the events they help shape. His book is a compact, useful guide of Asia's politics and personalities.

The Revolution of Nihilism

Published several months ago, *The Revolution of Nihilism*, by Hermann Rauschning, has perhaps become our most widely-quoted book on National Socialism and the dynamics of fascism. It has considerably influenced thinking in both academic and lay circles on the phenomenon of totalitarianism. So great has been its illumination that the light has carried over into huge adjacent areas of ideological and political thought.

Dr. Rauschning, former President of the Danzig Senate who resigned in protest over what he felt to be the increasing nihilism of the Nazi movement, originally published his book abroad. Were it not for Dorothy Thompson, it is possible that the book may not have gained an American editor. With the zeal of a crusader Miss Thompson talked and wrote about the book, describing it as one of the most significant to have been written in recent years.

The Revolution of Nihilism is an effective corrective for those who regard Nazism as a counteracting agent for Bolshevism. For Nazism, declares Dr. Rauschning, is itself an adaptation of Bolshevism. It has been moving toward a Bolshevist revolution ever since 1934. Dr. Rauschning pre-

dicted—months before the German-Russian rapproachment—that the two supposedly conflicting ideologies would cancel out their differences for mutual opportunism. "A German-Russian alliance," said Dr. Rauschning at least a year ago, "is Hitler's great coming stroke."

Days of Our Years

Pierre van Paassen's *Days of Our Years*, earliest of the year's non-fiction highlights, is reminiscent of Vincent Sheean's *Personal History*. It is semi-autobiographical, combined with a strong flavoring of observations and interpretations of world affairs. And like Sheean's book, it is exciting, stimulating reading. It has a wide range, from sketches of important personalities to a statement of his personal philosophy.

Still a leading non-fiction favorite after almost a year, *Days of Our Years* is more than mere good reading: its message is dynamic, challenging, convincing. It is an appeal for open minds and open hearts, for less hypocrisy and more honesty, whether among men or among nations. Van Paassen has been too close to humanity, has seen too much of it not to be repelled by theories of race supremacy. When used by man against man, these theories are bad enough; but when used by nations against man, these theories have become tragedies for the entire world.

The Life of Greece

The Life of Greece is the second of three volumes in Will Durant's series on *The Story of Civilization.* The first volume was *Our Oriental Heritage;* the third volume will be called *Caesar and Christ*. It will be a history of early Rome and Christianity and will appear, according to the publishers, in 1943.

Will Durant's new work, to exploit understatement, is a magnificent accomplishment. It was written by a man who some time ago had to decide whether to write two dozen or more good books during his lifetime, or three or four great ones. He decided to attempt the latter. He spent years in travel and research all over the world. His books represent not only a selective accumulation of the fruits of these years but the full range of his extraordinary erudition.

The Life of Greece is first-rate scholarship; but it is far from academic. Durant views Greece from the vantage point of one who has found a vast new enthusiasm and who discusses his findings with vitality and extraordinary comprehension.

Union Now

Out of Clarence Streit's *Union Now* has grown world-wide organizations actively supporting his proposal for a Federal union of the leading democracies. The book has taken firm root and many statesmen have declared it to offer the only permanent and sound solution for the world's major problems. It has been compared to the *Federalist* and other landmarks of political doctrine.

The idea for a United States on a broad scale is, of course, nothing new. Briand foresaw an era of continuous warfare in Europe unless such a plan were adopted. Mr. Streit's book derives its value from the effectiveness of his argument, the clarity of his plan for organization, the soundness of his approach. As Geneva correspondent for *The New York Times*, Streit watched at first hand the wheels within wheels of the League of Nations. He was fascinated by its possibilities, disturbed by its operation, dismayed by its blunders. He found it an "Alice in Wonderland world, devoted to the propositions that all nations are created superior, the part is greater than the whole and the day is longer than the year." His experiences and his observations at Geneva led him to seek a much more effective, more honest grouping of nations. What he proposes is a union of nations already brought together by "the one thing they share most, their common democratic principle."

(Continued on page 58)

"Silk Stockings in the Morning? Imagine!"

SILK stockings a luxury? Not today, but they were 25 years ago. So was an automobile, and a telephone. An incandescent lamp, not half so good as the one you now get for 15 cents, then cost more than twice as much. And you couldn't buy a radio or an electric refrigerator for love or money.

These are only a few of the things we accept today as commonplace. We expect wide, smooth, well-lighted streets. We want automatic heat in our homes, we clean our rugs with vacuum cleaners. When we go to the dentist we expect him to use an electric drill; we accept without comment an X-ray examination as part of a medical check-up. Luxuries? Not at all; they're part of the American standard of living.

How did they become common in so short a time? Not by some sudden change in our wealth and habits. It was through years of steady work by American industry—scientists, engineers, skilled workmen—developing new products, improving them, learning to make them less expensive so that more millions of people could enjoy them. And so, imperceptibly, they have changed from luxuries to necessities.

More than any other one thing, the increasing use of electricity in industry has helped in this progress. For more than 60 years, General Electric men and women have pioneered in making electricity more useful to the American people—have led in creating More Goods for More People at Less Cost.

G-E research and engineering have saved the public from ten to one hundred dollars for every dollar they have earned for General Electric

Presidential Year 1940

For the second time in a quarter of a century, the United States enters a Presidential year under the shadow of European war. In 1916 the fact of war, obscuring domestic issues, turned the probable defeat of Woodrow Wilson into narrow victory. "What will Europe's present war mean in the 1940 elections?" the parties and hopefuls are asking. As they plan the preliminary jousts, answer eludes them.

In the great game of presidential politics, the strategy for nomination-getting is various. Time-honored is the swing around the circuit that gives the public a chance to gape at and hear a candidate. Most prominent among those who have recently made such swings are Thomas Edward Dewey and Robert Alphonso Taft.

"Tom" Dewey at thirty-seven is younger than any other presidential contender in memory. His opponents have charged him with inexperience, declaring that his public service has been largely limited to the District Attorney's office in New York County. But in the Dewey camp the charges have apparently caused no worries. Around the "D.A." have been gathered experts in various fields. They coach and advise and groom, and their man, they have found, is not shy about taking advice. A few weeks ago, Mr. Dewey's hat was tossed formally into the ring, and he set about selling himself to the country.

Westward he traveled, to Minneapolis, his train stopping at stations *en route* where crowds gathered to see New York's Racketbuster No. 1. In Minneapolis, where 12,000 packed the hall and thousands more massed outside, Candidate Dewey opened up. He assailed the New Deal, accused it of "defeatism," asserted that optimistic faith in the continued growth of the nation was the Republican mood. The thousands cheered.

Thereupon Mr. Dewey hurried to Washington, where the Gridiron Club was holding one of its famous dinners. Present were Governors from many states, Senators and Congressmen, editors, industrial leaders. It was good business for any party contender to sit with them for an evening.

Before signing off for the Christmas holidays, Mr. Dewey made one more important personal appearance. Before the Pennsylvania Society of New York he attacked the New Deal for "zigzag" policies toward business and finance. Shifting policies, he said, had begot uncertainty, chilling the self-confidence of business. Continued hard times had been the result. Now the country should "change doctors."

Dewey campaign managers will not seek convention delegates in States with "favorite sons." That rules out any Dewey invasion of Ohio, home of Senator Robert A. Taft, who hopes to prove that a Taft should always follow a Roosevelt.

Senator Taft, the serious-minded, conservative son of the former President, has been on circuit for many weeks. He has crossed the country from his own Cincinnati to Portland and Seattle and Tacoma. He has penetrated the Southwest. He has spoken in New York and New England. His managers—the Taft headquarters is said to be one of the busiest—have been reported in the South, collecting delegates, and in other sections where Taft sentiment might be transmuted into convention support.

Both Dewey and Taft managers are confident that they will take to the Republican convention blocs of delegates that would mean much in

A Message from President Roosevelt to Current History

Hearty congratulations to Current History on the completion of its first quarter-century.

I am glad that the theme of your twenty-fifth anniversary is "Looking Forward." Month by month Current History has chronicled the events of the world since its first number was issued from the press. Many of the years during these past twenty-five years have witnessed tumult, upset and change—a breaking away from the old anchorages which gave men security and a sense of strength.

Happily for us, we do not know what the future holds. But we can hail with hope and happiness your anniversary slogan: "Looking Forward" in full expectation that no matter what the past has unfolded, today is better than yesterday and tomorrow will be better than either.

Very sincerely,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Hyde Park, New York,
December 16, 1939.

the manœuvers for the nomination. Whether either man would be strong enough to win the prize was another story. Some Washington observers believed that Michigan's Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, a recognized contender, but saying nothing, would emerge ultimately as the chief Republican hope.

Garner Is Willing

A red-faced, white-haired man of 71, dressed in hunting clothes, drove away last month from the red-brick house that is the best known in Uvalde, Texas. Vice-President John N. Garner was off to try his luck with a gun, and he had just announced—in forty words—that he was a candidate for the 1940 Democratic Presidential nomination. He would not, he said, try to corral delegates himself, but he would take the nomination if it was offered.

The announcement was not unexpected. Garner men have been at work for months. Their literature has been in the mails and they have been booming the Vice-President constantly as a man midway between the New Deal and Republican conservatism. Until the formal announcement Mr. Garner himself had had nothing to say.

Though the Vice-President is vigorous and healthy, the fact that he is already older than any man who has ever occupied the White House has not been overlooked by his opposition. His opponents also charge that his long legislative record as a Representative showed more attention to political manœuvering than to formulating his own ideas into law.

What exactly the Administration planned was veiled in the larger uncertainty of whether President Roosevelt would seek a third-term or would boom some heir, not yet apparent. The President kept his own counsel, but around him a swelling chorus affirmed that the international crisis demanded he stay in the White House. That again brought up the question: What would Europe's present war mean in the 1940 elections?

Dies vs. Mrs. Roosevelt

Eleanor Roosevelt, in her travels, lectures, writings, has sounded a sustained note of interest in American youth and American housewives. She wants to help them, and to help them to help themselves. She has proved it by advice and encouragement, and by participating in their organizations. Both interests recently brought her smack up against the Dies Committee in its investigation of un-American activities. Both caused her to step down from her customary position of not interfering with governmental matters.

The American Youth Congress, an organization that claims membership of 4,681,000 through affiliated societies and is dedicated to bettering the nation's young people, set off the first fireworks. Mrs. Roosevelt has been a sponsor of it, has spoken to its meetings and been friendly with its leaders. But from time to time there have been charges that the A.Y.C. was Communist-dominated. The Dies Committee took up the charges.

The committee declined to hear the First Lady's testimony on the issue, but she nevertheless appeared at the hearings and sat with A.Y.C. members, taking notes. She also invited A.Y.C. representatives to luncheon at the White House. "As far as is humanly possible," she wrote afterward, "I give to young people whom I know and trust the feeling that in any situation, particularly a difficult one, they may count on my assistance." A.Y.C. testimony tended to controvert other testimony that Communists run the Congress show.

Consumers organizations, which attempt to aid housewives in buying to better advantage and to improve standards of products, furnished the next cause for a brush between Mrs. Roosevelt and the Dies Committee. A report issued while the committee was in recess alleged that there was much that was Communistic in the consumers groups. "Transmission belts," they were called, and it was argued that Communists used them to arouse buyers against business and to discredit the "economic structure."

The report stirred the organized consumers to loud protest. In her syndicated newspaper column Mrs. Roosevelt accused the Dies Committee of undemocratic procedure, of bringing charges without safeguards for the accused, of acting on the un-American assumption that a man is guilty until proved innocent. President Roosevelt had something of the same to say at a press conference. Both agreed, however, that it was for Congress to decide whether the committee should be continued. Mr. Dies, ill in his Texas home, awaited the Congressional decision.

Anniversary Issue

With this issue CURRENT HISTORY celebrates its 25th anniversary. Today it is the oldest American monthly magazine devoted to national and international affairs. During the quarter of a century which spanned the outbreak of the two greatest wars in modern times the publication has changed hands only twice. Published by its sire, *The New York Times*, for more than two decades, it was sold to M. E. Tracy in 1936 and then to the present proprietors in January 1939.

In the publishing field, where life is ever precarious, such longevity has a definite meaning. It indicates the fundamental need for a considered approach to the great questions of our day. In communicating facts to a public interested as never before in politics, people, government and economics, our able neighbors in radio, in daily and weekly journalism are giving America a service undreamt of in the days before the First World War. CURRENT HISTORY, however, is the only national monthly that fills a want which the gatherer of news, working under the stress of day-to-day events, cannot meet. The urgent need for a publication presenting unbiased, objective interpretation called CURRENT HISTORY into being in 1914. That need still exists. Perplexed by a mass of conflicting fact, rumor, and propaganda the American people, in CURRENT HISTORY, are offered a clarifying record for today—and tomorrow—that no other American monthly can now attempt to provide.

Twenty-five years of CURRENT HISTORY not only show evidence of vitality; they testify to the impartiality with which our predecessors—and we hope ourselves—have edited the magazine.

Heretofore CURRENT HISTORY has scrupulously maintained editorial non-partisanship. Its editors will continue to maintain this attitude. But on one point we are committed. We are against American participation in the present European war. We want America to stay out of that war. Should circumstances, not yet apparent, arise to affect the national well being, we shall, of course, be prepared to alter that position. Until then—and may the moment never arrive—we are opposed to those influences which would involve us in armed conflict with any nation in the world.

Ohioans in Need

Squash is a native American vegetable, and some Americans like it. Last month Cleveland reliefers had to like it willy-nilly. Twenty-four carloads bearing 100,000 squashes were rushed to the city, and recipes for everything from baked squash to squash soup were handed out. It was part of a federal move to keep the city's needy from starving.

Cleveland, sixth largest city in the country, was in trouble. There was a shortage of money to care for the destitute. Toledo also was on short rations. So was Youngstown. Officials and the needy cried aloud for help.

A tangled financial, legal and political skein could be blamed. Ohio's Legislature, dominated by rural members, tends to underestimate city relief problems. At its last session the Legislature, refusing to approve a $24,000,000 relief program, enacted a $10,000,000 program instead—half to be financed by the State, half by the municipalities. That put the cities on the spot, especially since the bulk of their income is raised by real estate taxes that are limited by the State Constitution. Most of the State's income comes from a sales tax

With the needy pounding on the door, Cleveland's Mayor Harold H. Burton appealed to Governor John W. Bricker for aid through a special session of the Legislature. The Governor refused, said the trouble was the fault of the cities, that he had warned them to put things in order and to shoulder a fair share of their burdens. Though both men are Republicans, a political feud developed, and it was not overlooked that Governor Bricker, a budget-balancer, was suspected of presidential ambitions.

Washington took a hand in the crisis. The W.P.A. was expanded. Surplus food, the squash included, was hurried to Ohio for the needy. Secretary of the Interior Ickes called the Bricker attitude "heartless" and President Roosevelt, by implication, laid the blame at the Governor's door. Mr. Bricker, in speech and statement, accused the W.P.A. of playing politics, of increasing its rolls before elections and decreasing them afterward when Republicans scored the victory. But such charges did not feed or clothe the needy, nor end the worries of city governments. The Governor meanwhile insisted that "Ohio's relief situation is in very good shape."

Fitzpatrick—*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*

"Yes, Mr. Dies, I'm a Rhode Island Red."

N.L.R.B. Under Fire

Howard W. Smith, fifty-six year old Virginia lawyer, banker and farmer, has served in Congress for over a decade, journeying to the Capital from historic, red-brick Alexandria across the Potomac. He is a conservative Democrat—he had been marked for "purging" in 1938. Of recent weeks, he has been spending long hours in the high-ceilinged caucus room of the Old House Office Building, acting as chairman of a special committee investigating the National Labor Relations Board.

Ever since the Wagner Act of 1935 created it, the N.L.R.B. has been a storm center. Employers charged that it functioned undemocratically as prosecutor, judge and jury. Organized labor, thanks to the C.I.O.-A.F. of L. split, accused it of favoring one side against the other. Torrents of oratory and tides of printed words beat upon the three-man board that sought to guarantee the Wagner Act's promise that labor should enjoy the right of collective bargaining.

At the last regular session of Congress Representative Smith went gunning for the N.L.R.B. He offered a resolution to investigate it. Though he had voted originally against the Wagner Act, and though Mrs. Mary Norton, chairman of the House Labor Committee, charged that he had never voted for a single bill to benefit labor, the resolution passed. The investigators were to seek answers to these questions: Has the N.L.R.B. been fair and impartial? What effect has the Wagner Act had on labor disputes, employment and business conditions? Is new legislation needed to make the law work? The House gave the committee $50,000, and made Representative Smith committee chairman.

Hearings began on December 11—they will continue well into 1940. Mr. Smith in bat-wing collar and large four-in-hand tie was a prominent figure, as was the committee's counsel, Edmund M. Toland, forty-one year old Washington lawyer, whose expressionless face and slow manner did not point to anything sensational. But quickly it appeared that Mr. Toland, after the style of Ferdinand Pecora in the banking inquiry of six or seven years ago, would offer daily sensations.

He brought board members and labor union leaders before the committee. From a truckload of findings, he drew documents that made wit-

nesses squirm. He made it seem that the board had been divided against itself, that members had indulged in favoritism, that strange intrigues and pressures had been part of the N.L.R.B.'s history. What it would all add up to, in the committee's final report, was something else again.

Red War on Finland

Russia's undeclared war on Finland began after the Soviet radio reported that during the night of November 29 Finnish troops had "invaded" Soviet soil. By the following morning war was raging all along the Russo-Finnish frontier. The hostilities followed Finland's stubborn refusals to grant Moscow's demands for military bases in Finland which would bring her under Russian domination, as Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have been brought in the past few months. When Premier Cajander made Finland's position clear, he was villified in the Russian press.

Factory workers and students in Russia were rallied to denounce the Finns, who, they charged, were threatening Leningrad, 20 miles away, and who refused to move the Finnish frontier back 15 miles. Simultaneously the Moscow radio called on the Finnish people to revolt and overthrow their government. To the Finns this was all too reminiscent of similar Russian moves before Red troops marched into Eastern Poland in September.

Propaganda from Moscow for years had characterized Russia as peace-loving, and only last March Stalin solemnly declared: "We stand for rendering support to nations which have fallen prey to aggression and are fighting for their independence." But the pose of peace-lover cracked when the Russian hordes stormed into little Finland to convert the most democratic of all European nations to the Moscow brand of peace and democracy.

Under Field Marshal Baron Mannerheim, the Finnish army of 100,000 stood off the over-confident Russians during the early weeks of the war. The Finnish resistance thrilled the world, creating millions of sympathizers in the United States, Britain, France, Belgium, Latin America and elsewhere. Italian fighting planes flew up from Rome, refueled in Germany, and hurried to the Finnish front lines. There they were joined by bombers from Britain.

As a preliminary to the war, Premier Cajander resigned and a new Finnish cabinet was established by Risto Ryti, president of the National Bank. Meanwhile, Russia established a puppet "Finnish People's government" in Eastern Finland, a few miles from the border. It was headed by Otto Kuusinen, Finnish Communist, who for 20 years had been exiled in Russia. Moscow immediately recognized the puppet government, and refused to deal with the regular government, which the Moscow press scored as a tool of "Finnish bourgeois landlord rulers incited and supported by world imperialism." *Izvestia*, in Moscow, charged that the Finnish "attack" on the Soviet was part of a British plan to "transform the present imperialist English-German war into an anti-Soviet war."

Fighting savagely, the Finns defended their country. On December 17 they announced that they had blocked a Russian assault planned to cut Finland in two at its narrow "waist" and had stopped other Red attacks. In Moscow's *Pravda* an indignant author declared: "When our tired men wanted to drink they found all the village wells filled with earth . . . and hardly had the first Red soldier set foot on Finnish soil when a blast rent the air—a mine! Mines are everywhere . . . what cads, these Finns! They are masters of foul play."

Finland's defenders were depending heavily on deep snow and long, dark nights which made invasion difficult. But despite the gallant stand of the little democracy, there was a world-wide fear that in the end the Russo-Finnish war could have only one possible outcome.

G. E.'s New Chairman

HE joined the artillery in the World War but was kept out of the trenches by appendicitis. He admits "playing an excellent game of bridge but always holding rotten cards." He has never been in debt. He never reads newspaper sports or society columns. He is an excellent impromptu speaker. He smokes cigarettes in a holder. He takes his secretary's advice on when to get a haircut . . . .

Such odds and ends would hold little interest if his name were not Philip Dunham Reed—a name which will soon be as familiar as that of Owen D. Young. For on January 1, Mr. Reed succeeds Mr. Young as chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Company, the world's largest manufacturer of electrical equipment, with more than sixty thousand employees. Mr. Reed celebrated his fortieth birthday on November 16, the day before he was elected chairman. Like Mr. Young, he found the track to the top a fast one. He joined the firm as patent attorney thirteen years ago, just as Young joined G. E. as a lawyer only nine years before he became its head.

The new chairman says he was "lucky." His associates say that mere luck would never explain his success. He was lucky to have for a father William D. Reed, who started with the Northwestern National Insurance Company of Milwaukee as office boy and recently retired as president. But there was little luck in his years at the University of Wisconsin where he earned his B. S. in electrical engineering by lugging baggage in Milwaukee's railroad station.

Immediately after his graduation, he married a co-ed named Mabel Smith and went to New York to join a patent law firm, which required technical engineering knowledge. The firm had discovered it was easier to make a lawyer out of an engineer than an engineer out of a lawyer. Working all day at the office, he studied law nights at Fordham University. Even before he was admitted to the bar, he was fighting and winning patent cases. When he is matched against a lawyer on a case, he prefers that his opponent be a man of ability. "A man of ability," he says, "is never mean or suspicious."

He joined G. E. in 1926—at one-third of the salary he had been earning—became counsel to its incandescent lamp department in 1934, assistant to the president in 1937, and a director in 1938. When work is over, he quits the forty-sixth floor of the G. E. building in New York City, commutes to Westchester County, to join his wife, his fifteen year old son and his twelve year old daughter. For exercise, he goes in for squash and golf, and he plays the piano, but not very well. Modestly, he says his biggest job now is "to concentrate on learning to run the business."—GORDON HAMILTON.

Rallying for Finland

Over 2416 Tracy Place, in the exclusive Washington district called the Kalorama tract, waves the blue and white banner of the Finnish Republic. There until last month Hjalmar J. Procope, the Finnish Minister, lived quietly and uneventfully. The sudden Russian attack upon his country changed all that.

Its activity was paralleled in the State Department, where officials of the Eastern European section of the European Division went on twenty-four hour duty. Behind closed doors they conferred, studied dispatches, telephoned, wrote dispatches to go abroad. Finland, once a mere name to most Americans, had become a burning issue.

President Roosevelt showed his concern over Finland from the start. He had Secretary of State Hull offer the good offices of the United States to avoid a Russo-Finnish war. Finland accepted the offer. Russia refused. The President pleaded with both countries to avoid bombings of civilians. He denounced the Russian "resort to force" and urged American arms-makers to impose a "moral embargo" on munitions sales to the Soviets.

The government went further. To the Finnish Republic, which even in the midst of war kept its record clean by paying the semi-annual installment on its American war debt, credits of $10,000,000 were extended by federal agencies.

Public sentiment rallied to the Finns. Mass meetings denounced the Russian invasion. Funds began to be subscribed to aid the embattled republic of 4,000,000 people. To give fund-raising and distribution proper organization Herbert Hoover returned to the work that made him famous during the World War and after. He took the chairmanship of the Finnish Relief Fund, Inc. High above New York's Lexington Avenue, in offices occupied by an organization heir to the famous Commission for Relief in Belgium, Mr. Hoover began his job. About him were pictures of Belgium in the World War, reminders of his former encounter with war and its suffering.

America's Finns—about 150,000 are of Finnish birth—united in support of their native land. Benefits were held, money and clothing collected. Some sailed for Europe to take up arms in defense of Finland.

The Salt Lake Tribune

In area Finland, attacked by mighty Russia, is less than twice as large as the State of Utah.

League Expels Russia

Wellington Koo, veteran Chinese diplomat, whistled in surprise when he heard that the League of Nations proposed to brand Russia as an aggressor against Finland and oust her from membership. "China got nothing like that," said Koo, who at every League Council session since 1931 had demanded more than "moral support" for China against Japan.

Since 1934, when Russia was admitted to the League, she had been using it as a sounding-board to propagate her claimed ideals of world peace, drastic disarmament and collective security. Then came her ruthless attack on Finland, following her bloodless domination of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and the long moribund and futile League sprang into life, functioning as spiritedly as the idealist President, Woodrow Wilson, once dreamed.

On December 14, the League Council, following similar action by the Assembly, found that, by its aggression against Finland, "the U.S.S.R. has placed itself outside the League," adding: "It follows that the U.S.S.R. no longer is a member." Indicating their present fears, the countries which have most to lose by incurring Russia's enmity—notably the Scandinavian and Baltic nations, and, by an ironic twist, China—either declined to support the expulsion or supported it half-heartedly.

So the League was weakened by loss of another member at the same time that it was strengthened by vigorous, positive action in support of its principles.

The League—The Record

The idea of a federation of nations was not new when President Wilson, in an address to Congress, expounded his Fourteen Points, calling for "a general association of nations" to guarantee international security. The proposal had an immensely favorable reception throughout the world. Here at last seemed a reasonable plan to achieve lasting peace for men of good will everywhere.

Two years later, the League of Nations came into being. There was to be an Assembly, in which every member was to have one vote, but the working directorate was to be the Council, to consist of the United States, Britain, France, Italy and Japan, with four temporary members elected by the Assembly.

At the outset, twenty-nine states joined the League, including six members of the British Empire, which, it was charged, gave Britain undue weight in League policies. Thirteen other states came in soon thereafter. By 1935, the League had sixty members; virtually every state of the world has been a member at one time or another, with the striking exception of the United States.

The jolt given the League when we refused to join is history. But there were other jolts in store. At the opening meeting the Argentine delegates walked out of the Assembly in annoyance, and Argentina took no active part in League affairs until 1933. Costa Rica dropped out in 1924; Brazil left two years later on the entrance of Germany.

In 1933, Japan resigned when the League condemned her as guilty of aggressive warfare in Manchuria. Germany did likewise soon after the accession of Hitler, claiming she had not been granted equality in armaments. Italy followed suit when League members invoked sanctions against her to punish her for invading Ethiopia. With the United States, Japan, Germany and Italy out, the only great powers remaining are Britain and France.

Attempts by the League, however feeble, to live up to its principles have cost it dearly in membership; its vacillation and timidity have lost it millions of friends. Yet it is probable that, because of its firm treatment of Russia, the League today enjoys more respect than it has had for many years.

War at Sea

Twenty-five years after the German battleship *Scharnhorst* was sunk in battle in the South Atlantic, taking down with her Admiral Count Spee, the 10,000-ton German pocket battleship *Graf Spee*, named for the gallant Admiral, steamed into Montevideo, Uruguay, her superstructure badly damaged after a running fight with three British cruisers. On board were thirty-six dead and sixty wounded. One of the British cruisers, the *Exeter*, also was badly damaged.

The *Graf Spee* had unexpectedly encountered the British cruiser *Ajax*, convoying the French passenger liner *Formose*. Laying down a smoke screen to hide the *Formose*, the *Ajax* called for help and the *Exeter* and *Achilles* arrived at full speed.

The fight took place only a few miles off the coast of Uruguay and flashes of gun fire could be seen from shore. Hour after hour the battle raged, with the cruisers worrying the pocket battleship doggedly, though none of them equalled her in size or firing power.

Immediately the British warboats *Ajax* and *Achilles* took up stations outside the harbor while the Admiralty sped other ships to stand a "death watch," assuming that the *Graf Spee* would have to take to sea again or be interned for the duration of the war. Instead, on December 17, the *Graf Spee* committed suicide. On orders from Chancellor Hitler, Captain Langsdorff loaded his crew into barges, stood in a launch with his saluting officers, pressed a button on an electric cable leading to a mine in the magazine, and blew her out of existence. Loss of one of her three pocket battleships was a heavy blow to Germany.

Meanwhile, the war at sea raged on. From September 3 to mid-December 201 vessels with a gross tonnage of 788,676 had been lost. British shipping suffered most severely with 104 vessels of 416,870 tons sent to the bottom as compared to 17 German vessels of 83,541 tons. As usual, neutrals were hard hit, losing 69 ships.

In large part, mines were responsible for the British losses. It was to retaliate for the alleged indiscriminate laying of mines by German planes and submarines that the British, early in December, placed an embargo on German exports as well as imports. The United States, Japan, Russia, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries, all neutral nations with a large sea-borne commerce, lodged complaints with London against this move, but Britain went firmly ahead.

Hvepsen, Oslo, Norway

"What our streets would look like if individuals behaved like nations."

Russia's Molotov

By virtue of his office, Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, Premier and Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., is the official voice of Soviet Russia. He has a speech impediment, but off the speaker's platform he is an impressive personality: he has a fine forehead, neatly cropped mustache, and blue eyes. Broad-shouldered, well-tailored, he represents the newer Soviet bureaucracy which eschews the peasant blouses of the older revolutionaries.

Yet he can claim a modest place among the heroes of the revolution. He was born in 1890, the son of Mikail Skryabin, a store clerk. He became a member of the Bolshevik party while still a high school student, taking his oath under the pseudonym Molotov. He was caught in a Czarist police net, served a two-year term of exile, and returned to enroll at the St. Petersburg Polytechnical Institute. In 1912, at the age of twenty-two he became an editor of the Bolshevik daily *Pravda*, whose managing director was Josef Stalin.

Molotov hovered in the background for the next few years. But in 1918, '19 and '20, he supervised the nationalization of industries in Northern Russia and was sent on propaganda missions about the country. Thereafter, he plunged into party organization, acquiring the reputation of a disciplinarian. In 1926, he became a member of the Polit-Bureau, policy-making section of the Communist party. From here his career closely complements that of Stalin, the party's First Secretary. Stalin apparently discovered hidden talents in Molotov, for the young official became Stalin's right-hand man in the eventually successful struggle for control of the party. In 1930 Molotov was made President of the Council of Commissars, the figurative head of the Soviet State.

Behind the forbidding walls of the Kremlin, Stalin's and Molotov's offices adjoin. Unlike many of the old revolutionaries who gave the Stalin regime so much trouble, congenial Mr. Molotov has hardly been abroad, has none of their restless cosmopolitan flavor. He knows Marxist gospel by heart, but is not one of those flighty intellectuals with whom Stalin has never felt at ease.

With Litvinov's dismissal last spring, Molotov became Foreign Affairs Minister and burst into international prominence. Since then it has been his duty to clarify for his astonished audience abroad and for his own countrymen the rapid evolutions of Stalinist foreign policy. He has attempted to explain and defend the German-Russian pact, the annexation of East Poland, and the heavy-fisted dealings on the Baltic. His oratorical blows have fallen indiscriminately on British, French and Germans, on statesmen of Finland, Sweden and Rumania, on the President of the United States. He has thrice received Germany's Von Ribbentrop at the Kremlin.

Stalin is content to sit in the driver's seat while Comrade Molotov plays barker, describing for all who will listen the new landscape of the Soviet foreign policy, doing as best he can to make Russian Imperialism and Marxist Utopia meet.—ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ.

LOOKING FORWARD TO 1940

VINCENT SHEEAN

I. The Future of Europe

►► Issues within issues of the present conflict indicate a long era of continuous warfare

THE questions at issue in Europe during the present phase of the world struggle are far from being defined. In spite of demands from the press, the public and the House of Commons, the British government finds it impossible to state its aims in the war beyond a vague declaration against "Hitlerism" and an aspiration towards the restitution of the states Hitler has destroyed. Anything more exact—any program involving concrete proposals for settlement—would be politically out of the question for a government containing so many different elements. King George VI says that England has no material gain in mind in this war: that England is fighting only for freedom. He omits to mention that England is simultaneously denying freedom to the 350,000,000 inhabitants of India. In France, the Daladier government, exercising powers which approach the dictatorial, declares itself in the usual cloudy terms of peace and democracy, but at the same time enforces a repressive system of war legislation under which people are sentenced to eighteen months in jail for discussing the possibility of peace. There is equal confusion and contradiction on the side of Germany. The National Socialist movement, which began as a crusade against Bolshevism, finds itself strangely engaged in a war which it can hope to win only with the aid of the Bolsheviks, if then.

Russia, the "bulwark of peace," as its rulers have sanctimoniously declared for twenty years, is engaged in a disgraceful attempt to conquer the industrious, peaceful, social democratic citizens of a neighboring republic. And, for comic relief, Italy, the vainglorious conqueror of Ethiopia, Spain and Albania, paralyzed with fear of taking sides in the greater conflict, has stepped forward as the champion of the oppressed and is sending aid to Finland.

In all this welter of contradiction it is no longer possible to discern the nice, clean lines which used to separate—a year ago, say—the sheep from the goats, the Fascists from the anti-Fascists, the progressive and democratic forces from those which would enslave humanity.

It is my opinion that all this confusion cannot be cleared away by one war. Let us assume that the British calculation is correct, that two years of blockade will produce a collapse of the Nazi regime in Germany. What then? The proposals which circulate in Paris, tending toward a partition of Germany, a reconstitution of the Hapsburg monarchy in the Danube region, and a deliberate enthronement of the anti-democratic, monarchist and reactionary elements in Central Europe, would be worse than no solution at all. It is more than likely that the British, who see more clearly in these matters, will prevent the adoption of such ideas.

But if they do not adopt the reactionary solution of the French, what else have they to offer? Will it be possible to find enough remnants of the old democratic and liberal force of Germany to recreate a republic there? How quickly and easily would such a republic slip into the clutches of the Russians, after two or three years of blockade and suffering? The possibility is, I understand, very seriously considered in the most responsible quarters in London; and all this talk about federation which has suddenly sprung up is in part an attempt—belated and almost despairing—to make a truly European program in which Germany, too, would not arise hungry from supper.

Yet we know of old the infinity of problems which confront any serious attempt at concerted, super-national action. The League of Nations, a much more modest attempt in the same direction, was doomed from the beginning by the stubborn opposition of suspicious, hyper-patriotic elements which are always stronger in governments than in peoples. Can any scheme of federation succeed when even the poor old League failed? And even supposing—by a maximum effort of optimism—that it may be possible to invent a scheme of federation which will take in all the exhausted countries of the continent on terms approaching political and economic equality, what is to be the relationship of such a federation to the aggressive development of Soviet Russia? Is Russia to be admitted, to disrupt, or excluded, to attack, the proposed or suggested harmony of Europe?

I CANNOT imagine any solution of the present situation which could be permanent. Rather, it seems to me, will the era upon which we are entering develop into a prolonged struggle on a world scale, with uneasy intervals of armed and nervous peace, with civil disunion and internecine strife complicating the agony of two or three generations. I do not think fifteen or twenty years would be a too lavish estimate of the time required to reach some kind of equilibrium between the complex forces now unleashed. Wars of class, race and nation are bitter enough separately, but what we have now is all of them at once.

It is impossible for any human

THE EDITORS OF CURRENT HISTORY welcome the distinguished contributors who assist us in celebrating the magazine's 25th Anniversary. The general theme which they follow in their respective articles is "Looking Forward to 1940"—and, in some cases, beyond. Necessarily such an approach calls for expressions of personal opinion. May we remind our readers that these expressions of personal opinion do not reflect the policy of CURRENT HISTORY or alter its traditional attitude of non-partisanship?

VINCENT SHEEAN, like John Gunther, is a Chicago product who served as a newspaper correspondent in Europe for a Chicago paper and who was catapulted into the limelight largely as the result of a single book. Sheean called his book *Personal History*. It was a remarkable achievement in autobiography; its success prepared the way for a long series of books by foreign correspondents on their observations and personal experiences. Sheean, "Jimmy" to his friends, is six feet tall, distinguished looking, forty, prematurely gray. He likes people, especially those whose views honestly differ from his own. He loves to argue, spent most of last summer with Dorothy Thompson and Sinclair Lewis on their farm in Vermont arguing politics and international affairs. He was introduced by Dorothy Thompson at the World's Fair last spring as a journalist who in a bygone era would have been a great poet, but who was swept up in one of history's great surges and so became one of its most sensitive chroniclers. He is married to the former Lady Diana Forbes-Robertson, beautiful daughter of the famous English actor. They have two daughters, Belinda, two, and Patricia, born late last October. The Sheean family lives in Bronxville, New York.

Vincent Sheean

being now living to foresee with confidence what may result from such a prolonged struggle, in which the composition and alignment of the forces will be unceasingly altered. Even allowing for the evident determination on the part of British and Germans alike to go at it with some caution, preserving what can be preserved in the midst of war—and even allowing for the whole new military science of "machines" and "defensive war" put forward in England by Liddell Hart, now apparently dominant in all countries—it is still certain that the effort will bring financial exhaustion and consequently new financial and economic solutions, each of which must have its effect upon the political structure of the belligerent countries. The great capitalist class can scarcely hope to survive even a few years of such struggle. New social groups will become aware of the problem of power, and the comfortable traditional interpretations of democracy, those which make it an affair of the ballot-box, cannot hope to persuade any large masses of the people in any country for much longer.

Civil war is by no means impossible in any country on the continent of Europe; in some it is almost a certainty. The despair of the masses in all the larger countries of the continent—which, in spite of their power and military glory, have fared worse than the small, peaceful democracies—has reached the point where millions are convinced that they no longer have anything to lose. From this arose the monster, Fascism, which by the very extravagance of its claims and promises deludes the ordinary man into hopes which have no substance of reality, and which, even so, casts a heroic light over the toil and sorrow of the disinherited.

Schemes which aim at making people work harder for less rewards, and glory in it, are characteristic of the present regimes in Germany and Russia; nobody can say they have not deluded millions of the enslaved. This has come to be, indeed, the essential characteristic of Fascism: that it glorifies the cruel sacrifices which it unceasingly demands from its subjects, and gives them, in the very abjectness of their slavery, an ecstasy of achievement. Robbed of every right hitherto considered essential to the life of man, unable to choose their work or their place of abode or their forms of diversion, millions of workmen in Germany and Russia still believe—since they hear nothing else—that this condition of life is a sublime and splendid state which must be, by their effort, extended over the whole world.

This doctrine is so persuasive that it seems to me altogether likely to sweep over the whole continent of Europe during the era of struggle which we are now entering; and although I certainly do not regard Fascism as a final form of organization in any country, I think it will probably be a successful intermediate form in the social evolution of all those countries which are to be shaken to their roots by the present conflict. Some of them—Germany, Italy and Russia—are Fascist already, Russia with a socialist coloration but a Fascist practice, the others with a Fascist system but remnants of the capitalist structure surviving through it. The neighbors hitherto immune to the Fascist fever, such as France and the Low Countries, stand very little chance of resisting it through a prolonged struggle.

But Fascism—and this is very important—is not an international system of thought or practice. On the contrary, it raises nationalism and patriotism to greater heights of absurdity than history has ever recorded. One of the principal signs of the Fascist development of the Soviet Union was the intensification of Soviet chauvinism after 1935—the doctrine, expounded by every means known to propaganda, that the Soviet Union was in every way superior to every other state, that its industrialization surpassed that of the capitalist countries, that its citizens were better off than those of any other nation, that its armies were invincible, and that it was the highest privilege of a human being to work *and if necessary to die for the Soviet* state.

NOTHING could be further removed from the self-critical and democratic Communism of Lenin. The old Communism, that of Lenin and Trotzky, was rationalistic and therefore anti-Fascist to the core: it was also, and above all, international. The Communism of Stalin—starting from the basic theory of "socialism in a separate country"—evolved into a violently chauvinistic Fascism whose psychological content is indistinguishable from that of Hitlerism, just as its methods of propaganda are akin to those of Hitler. The only way in which such a movement understands internationalism is the way of conquest—the way of Bonaparte.

And this, of course, is why there can never be a Pax Fascistica in Europe or anywhere else. Even if Fascism conquered the whole of Europe it could not bring peace because it is virulently racial and nationalistic in character, exists by its claims of tribal superiority, and cannot possibly avoid conflict with other tribes which make the same claims. A Fascist France would still be the enemy of a Fascist Germany, only more so. The peace of exhaustion might, indeed, descend upon Fascist Europe, for a little while, but the appetites and passions which are fostered by Fascism cannot endure the superior pretensions or even the equality of other tribes. To the Fascist mind peace is, as Mussolini says, "an interval between wars," and is to be utilized only in the training and preparation for war, the highest state of mankind. A European continent won to Fascism (whether by conquest or by persuasion or by internal upheaval) would pause from war only long enough to get its breath, for, considered on the international scale, Fascism in any one country is little more than a dream of conquest, and must clash with the kindred but rival Fascism of its neighbors.

Democracy's chance of survival through such a period as that upon which we are now embarked seems precarious. It depends upon whether or not there are, anywhere in the world, masses of human beings who believe in democracy enough to fight for it. Disillusionment has gone very far. Even here, in the United States of America, where a variety of social and economic ills have not yet altered the political system, young people of all classes reveal a general skepticism about democracy which sometimes startles their elders who are unprepared for it.

How much more must this be true in Europe! I think there may be a very powerful feeling for the defense of democratic freedoms in England, but even there, it seems to me, the institutions of *political* democracy have not passed through the ordeal of the past twenty years with general credit. That is, most Englishmen of all classes value the traditional liberties for which their ancestors for centuries have fought: the rights of ordinary life, habeas corpus and the trial by jury, the constitutional protection of the citizen against abuses of police power, the freedom of speech and discussion. These evoke the deepest response from people of British birth. And yet these same people are themselves more than a little skeptical, I think, about the value of the political institution of democracy, the virtues of government elected on the party system. The rulers of England have long been chosen from an oligarchy, from a single class, and the rest of the population has grown steadily more aware of it. In many a constituency in England the voters are asked to choose between a Conservative, a Liberal and a Labor candidate who are of exactly the same social class, have gone to the same schools and universities, and differ among themselves only upon the details of administration of a system which is not in the fullest sense democratic at all.

THAT is the anomaly of British political life, which, conducted ostensibly in the greatest freedom under universal suffrage and with democratic ideals, results actually in government by a single class under a variety of political labels. The Labor party seemed for a period to escape from the oligarchical rule, but later on—after its first taste of power in

Saturday Review of Literature

Territorial divisions of the five empires said to be envisaged by Germany following the Nazi "re-distribution" of the world. This map was based on material contained in* The Revolution of Nihilism, *by Hermann Rauschning.

1924—it ceased to represent the working class in any true sense, for its leaders were amalgamated into the oligarchy and many members of the old ruling class entered it for the sake of opportunity. Oddly enough, the most "advanced" leader of the Labor Party's Left wing is Sir Stafford Cripps, a wealthy man and the son of a peer; such is the British political system.

Does that system possess enough vitality to engage in a life-and-death struggle with the anti-democratic threat to Europe? It remains to be seen, but I have doubts which the present phase of united anti-Hitlerism in England does not dispel. There will arise many questions in the minds of the British masses during the coming years, and an unchanged, unchanging oligarchical system can scarcely begin to answer them, particularly when the economic strain becomes even more severe. The old demand for justice, equality, which Fascism answers in its own way by a denial of all freedom, must clash in time with the very liberties for which Englishmen are now asked to fight. It is much too soon to say that the devotion to democracy will be so great among the masses in Britain that they will endure for an unlimited period without questioning the structure of which they are the base. The remedy here—already perceived by many in England—is not repression and regimentation, since that is the road to Fascism itself, but a fairly comprehensive reform of the democratic structure so as to bring it more nearly into relation with the will of the masses of the people.

But before any such corrective action is taken in England I look to see this war come to some sort of indeterminate pause and resume again in another form. By the criminal folly of Stalin, the Soviet Union is now for the first time placed in that position which Stalin's propaganda has been talking about for twelve years—i.e., the position of being hated by the whole western world. Partly to justify and intensify a colossal military machine, partly to ensure his own tenure of power, Stalin began in 1927 to disseminate the fable of a "conspiracy against the Soviet Union." The theory was that all the capitalist powers were in combination against Russia, and that only by unquestioning obedience to the one divine leader could Russia be saved.

(Continued on page 58)

MAJOR LEONARD NASON

II. Military Strategy and Tactics

▶▶ Military objectives remain the same from war to war but tactics may radically change

STRATEGY is indirect action with military objectives. The strategic course of events, for instance, in a German invasion of France has not changed for two thousand years, but the tactical events have been different in each one. Two thousand years ago, the first time the Germans invaded France that we know of, they crossed the Rhine in the vicinity of Strasbourg in skin boats and drove the French away with mass action of clubs and stones. The fact that they crossed at this point was "strategy." The means they used to drive the French away was "tactics."

Strategically, Germany has been attacking France the same way and for the same reason throughout the Christian era. Tactically, France has used different *means* of beating off the invasion, varying from stones and clubs to the Maginot Line. Strategically, she has employed the same *method* for two thousand years. She looks about for an ally, and points out that, if the ally doesn't join with France to repel the German, later on the German will fall upon the ally, who will have to fight Germany alone.

MAJOR LEONARD NASON, who conducts a regular radio program over one of the major networks on the military progress of the war, is known as "Steamer" among his friends and frequently uses the nickname as a *nom de plume*. He was born in Massachusetts forty-four years ago, still has his home there. He was wounded twice in the World War, and decorated twice by General Pershing. After the war he turned to writing, establishing himself as a top-notcher in war-fiction and gaining a wide following, especially through *The Saturday Evening Post*, to which he is still a frequent contributor. He is married, has two girls and one boy. Among his well-known books are *Three Lights from a Match*, *Chevrons*, and *Top Kick*.

A military observer can predict strategic objectives, and so the course of military events, and the route of march of nations toward what they consider their place in the sun—it is a mere truism to say that he can do this and be right nine times out of ten.

But he cannot predict tactical events. Military students can predict, have predicted, that a certain war will break out in a certain year between certain powers, but they cannot predict what course that war will take, nor who will win it. All this is strange to the civilian mind, especially in this country. Civilians hire weather forecasters and read weather reports, but they pay no attention to the warnings of their soldiers.

Perhaps you begin to wonder why soldiers did not predict this present war. They did predict it, and not only that it was as inevitable as the running of a river to the sea; they predicted in print and in conversation the year it would break out.

And why didn't anyone hear about it? Because they wouldn't listen.

An army commander, in considering the future from a military standpoint, first isolates the forces in the field that are opposed to him, and tries to determine their objectives; that is, what these forces want, and what they might seize that would be of advantage to them. It logically follows that action will take place in that direction.

As this is written, in December, the largest army in the field is Russia's. Russia has dominated the European situation since the signing of the non-aggression pact with Germany in August, an act that took practically every capital in the world by surprise. From then on, everyone has watched Russia—the smaller nations with fear, the Allies with distrust and suspicion. Germany, too, you may be sure, keeps an eye on her surly neighbor. For the actions of Russia in the Baltic region so far have been a direct menace to Ger-

many. What Russia has done, the territory she has seized, represents only a move on a chess board to prepare for other moves, working for Russian domination of the Baltic Sea. Esthonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Finland—these countries are so many steps of an ascending staircase that leads to domination of the Baltic and of the Scandinavian countries.

Russia has other objectives more important than windows on the Baltic. There have been two schools of thought in Russia for centuries. One faced east, the other west. Under the czars these two schools apparently could not be reconciled, but under the present regime the one that faced west has been eliminated in the fashion we know of, by execution of its moral leaders. Marshal Tukachevsky died, not because of treasonable dealings with Germany, but because he was a supporter of Western civilization and its ideas, in other words, pro-Ally.

The eastern school of thought in Russia is anti-English. Yet, if those who believe Russia's destiny is in the east are in power, why should she attempt to dominate the Baltic? Because here is the only place where Russia could be attacked by a western power with any hope of success. Once Russia has protected her sally port in the Baltic, she will feel free to advance to her old national objective for centuries—Constantinople, the driving of the Turk from Europe, and the domination of the Balkans.

In the excitement of the last World War and the post war years, the nations generally have forgotten the Eastern Question that agitated the world in the time of our fathers. This question briefly stated was, "What right has the Turk with his pagan religion in Europe among Christians?"

In more recent years the world at large has been occupied with recovering from a disastrous war, and Russia with digesting an entire new diet of political thought. But now Russia has completed her preparations, squared her shoulders, put her armor on and stepped out. Since the days of Peter the Great, who first spoke of windows on the Baltic, Russia's dream has been to dominate the Black Sea and the Dardanelles. The Turks from Asia came into Europe in 1356 and advanced as far as Vienna before they were turned back. Peter the Great tried to drive them from Constantinople in 1711. Catherine tried again,

about the time of our war of independence, and succeeded in freeing the shores of the Black Sea and the Crimea.

Then, to thwart Russian expansion, England stepped in and expounded the theory on which Europe based its political thought until the last war, the so-called "Balance of Power." This, briefly stated, was that Russian power must not increase, nor must the power of Turkey decline. In 1877, when after the Russo-Turkish War the Russians could have taken Constantinople, England said "No." Russia has never forgiven her.

Who remembers the Holy Alliance —Russia, Germany, and Austria? This was formed to drive the Turk from Europe on the grounds of religious persecution of Christian authorities. To this Alliance were opposed England and France, not to protect the Turk, but to protect themselves and maintain the balance of power. Because of hatred of England, and the belief that her interests clashed with Russia's, there was a strong pro-German party in Russia during the World War. In that war Russia and the Allies were not allies at heart. Now they are not even allies in theory, and Russia once again feels free to take Germany's hand and go a-roving into the Balkans. Not this time to make Europe and the little countries safe for Christians, but safe for Communists. The old wars with a religious coating to hide the bitterness now have political sugaring.

The last conflict between England and Russia was the Crimean War, 1854-56, when England, France, and Turkey defeated the Muscovite. This war was to Russia what the last war was to Germany, a defeat and a humiliating dictated peace. Russia was shorn of what she considered her rights in the Balkans, Turkey was maintained as an independent power in Europe after a defeat in war. British statesmen boasted that they had stopped the march of Russian progress for a hundred years. It did not turn out that way. In my opinion, Russia, with Germany's help, will now set out to revise the Treaty of Paris, which wrested the Balkans from her, as Germany set out to revise the Treaty of Versailles.

Once this step is taken by Russia, it will mean the active involvement of Turkey, the involvement or surrender of Bulgaria and Rumania, and the involvement of Italy. If Russia's commitments in the north of Europe are too extended, she will have to withdraw troops from her Eastern army, weakening her defense against Japan, which may seize the opportunity to attack Russia in Manchuria. Foreign military writers have pointed out for some time that Russia has been organizing for war on two fronts. Perhaps with the above possibilities in mind.

If much of this analysis concerns Russia, it is because I feel that Russia is the most important nation now from the military viewpoint. From the moment Stalin signed the non-aggression pact with Hitler, Russia has stolen the show. I feel she will continue to hold it.

Meanwhile, for England and France, the outlook is not bright. Since the World War these two na-

tions have spent very little thought on the threatening looks and the half-drawn weapons of their neighbors. But war is no longer a matter of simply calling men to the colors, or a simultaneous springing to arms of the male population in defense of its firesides. It is a war of machines, that is to say, industry. England and France have had their industries organized for peace. While both of them are industrially strong, the change from peacetime to wartime production takes time. In the last war it took two and a half to three years for these two countries. In this war, technological progress may achieve the turnover in less time. But even if the time were halved, it would be next summer before the two could really produce munitions and machines in the rhythm required by modern needs on the battlefields.

Tanks, armored carriers of men and munitions, truck-drawn artillery, high speed airplanes cannot be quickly replaced once they are destroyed. It takes time to make modern ammunition, fired in enormous amounts by modern high speed weapons. Machines must be enlarged, factories changed over, new dies cut, new schedules of working hours arranged. Army commanders dare not engage in an offensive unless they are sure that the industries at home are geared to replace material at least at the rate it is being destroyed.

The nations of Europe started to increase their armaments in 1933, after Hitler's accession to power. At that time England apparently decided that she should increase and modernize her fleet. This was in keeping with the British tradition of sea power. Such a program obviously would be a defensive one, and expansion of the fleet would not arouse the opposition from peace-loving and over-optimistic thinkers that similar expansion of the army would develop. The British General Staff, while it experimented with army motorization, did not anticipate being called upon to undertake any strategic tasks on the continent.

In 1938, when France, abandoned by Belgium, betrayed by Russia, began to look frantically for an ally to meet the German menace, her only hope was England, which was in none too happy a situation herself. The only solution for England was conscription. This furnished man power, but not the necessary training required for modern warfare. I fear there is little hope of any action from England before late spring.

With characteristic adherence to tradition, Britain reinforced her bulwark, her fleet, but apparently not with forward-looking implements to meet new forms of attack by Germany. We have seen a first line unit of the Home Fleet sunk at its anchorage in what was a protected base. We have seen German raiding forces loose and apparently unhampered in their depredations on the high seas. We have seen sinkings from some new form of German mine almost reach the peak of the 1917 submarine campaign, when Germany had had three years to perfect her submarine tactics. All this in the first few months of war. That Britain's fleet will drink other bitter draughts before the spring would not seem too improbable.

As for France, she too has been sleeping under the shade of the olive branch of Locarno. France, more than any other large nation in the world, had fallen under the spell of Communism. That the outrages of some of her former political leaders were inspired by Moscow, as part of a general plan, would now seem to be highly plausible. France had strike after strike in her arms and air industries, and a forty hour week rigidly enforced, when German arms plants were running twenty-four hours a day seven days a week. She reduced her army service period to one year, just at the time when her effectives began to weaken because of the lower birth rate of war time years. The morale of her civilians and soldiers was injured by a succession of revolutionary, oppressive and arbitrary decrees that kept the country in a state of turmoil.

In this atmosphere, defense of a nation is neglected. Now France, four years behind in her preparations for defense, is faced with Germany, and

over Germany's shoulder can see the leer of her former model and ally, Russia. The Maginot Line will protect France this year, but I fear she will not be able to go beyond it.

What shall we say of Germany? Perhaps for the winter she will lie dormant behind the defenses of the Siegfried Line, knowing that neither England nor France can muster sufficient force to attack her. Meanwhile her submarines, her mines, and her air force will nibble bigger bites from the British fleet. All the assurances of confidence cannot hide the fact that British losses at sea have so far been staggering.

The other possibility for Germany is an offensive. There are two ways by which she may turn the Maginot Line, on which a frontal assault would be unthinkable. First, by invading Holland and Belgium, going down the channel coast, and then striking into France, the old plan of Von Schlieffen. This plan would isolate France and cut her communications with England. Then the French army could be destroyed in detail. The disadvantage of the plan would be the attack on two neutrals, and their possible ferocious resistance, tripping the German advance just long enough to unbalance it, as happened in 1914.

The other plan to turn the Maginot Line would be through Switzerland and the so-called corridor of Bale. But the Bale corridor is not wide enough to allow deployment on the scale necessary for modern armies with mechanized and motorized equipment. In addition, it would require a "river crossing," an extremely difficult operation, of the swift Rhine between Bale and Constance. Then, the river once crossed, an advance by way of Bale or Geneva to the Jura mountains, which would have to be crossed through the passes. Moreover, between Bale and Constance the Germans would find themselves face to face with a line of Swiss fortifications of much the same type as the French Maginot Line. A tough

(*Continued on page 62*)

III. Daladier: Premier of France

Portrait of an average Frenchman who rules France with greater powers than any of her recent leaders

EDOUARD DALADIER, Premier of France, who rules the country with full powers of a sort unparalleled in recent French history, lives in a modest four-room apartment on the Rue Anatole des Forges, a few moments from the Arc de Triomphe. The neighborhood is divided sharply between a fashionable sector and one not so fashionable. M. Daladier lives on the non-fashionable side.

M. Daladier is an average man. This is a central point for understanding his character. And he lives in an average French neighborhood. First you note the rounded glistening cobbles of the Rue Anatole des Forges, then the broad sidewalks of the Avenue Carnot, planted with plane trees. In the balconies of the upper apartments are bright flower boxes. Above them rise soft gray mansard roofs.

M. Daladier could live his whole life within a few yards of his apartment, and never lack anything. This is typical of Paris, where almost every neighborhood is self-sustaining. On the nearest corner is a big *café tabac*, advertising beer on its orange awning, with its terrace comfortably packed with orange rattan chairs. The *Boucherie de l'Etoile*, under a magenta awning, sells meat. Next is the *cremerie*, a truck loaded with empty milk bottles before it. Next, in the *boulangerie-patisserie*, you see windows stacked with French bread in slim loaves a yard long. Then a *pharmacie* full of cheap medicines and thermos bottles. The *coiffeur*, next in line, is followed inevitably by the dealer in antiquities, and by the wood-and-coal merchant. Then comes a shoe shop, then an electrician-locksmith, then a *papeterie* where the newspapers are neatly folded, French-fashion, the long way.

M. Daladier's office is at the Ministry of War. Daladier was War Minister before he became Premier. One of his great sources of power was his close connection with the army.

The low buildings of the Ministere de la Guerre are in the heart of the Faubourg St. Germain—the citadel of old France, the France of literate aristocracy, massive social tradition, and superb taste and cultivation. The pavements are not cobbled here, but polished, glistening asphalt. There are few shops; instead, gracious old family mansions, and a long façade of public buildings.

This is the gamut that Daladier represents: the typical bourgeois small-Frenchman, a self-sufficient individualist, transported by the pressure of events to the arena of politics and military affairs in a world of mass conflicts.

Daladier is short and stocky, with big shoulders and heavy hands. His eyes are a bright blue, below uncombed eyebrows that dart upward. The forehead is broad, the hair sparse. He smiles almost continually when he talks: a quick, perceptive smile, punctuated by short bursts of rather hard laughter. His conversation is quick and to the point. He likes badinage, but doesn't waste much time on it. He can lose his temper easily.

I asked one of Daladier's close collaborators what aspect of France the Premier most clearly represented. The answer came that Daladier, a peasant born of peasant stock, above all represented the land—the soil—the good earth—of France. As a peasant Daladier believes unalterably in private property, in personal ownership of land. As a peasant, too, he stands for hard work, for tenacious cultivation of his soil. He wants to hold what he has. Again as a peasant he is both an individualist and a democrat. He stands for himself; he stands also for equality with his fellow men. Finally, like most peasants, Daladier is a bit ingrown, a bit suspicious. He buttons his collar close, as the French say.

Premier Daladier

He worked a hard day as a child; he works a hard day now. He arrives at his office early. He goes home to lunch, returning to the office in mid-afternoon and staying at his desk till perhaps nine o'clock in the evening. He is not always easy to work with; when fatigued he may ride his associates hard.

DALADIER sees comparatively few people. He has no social life at all. He isolates himself at home or in his office. Diplomats find it difficult to see him, except the American Ambassador, William C. Bullitt, whom he likes and trusts deeply. Few people know him well.

Daladier has no interest in money. He lives on his salary, and has never been touched by financial or other scandal. He likes good food and lots of it. He smokes moderately, mostly a pipe. He drinks as any normal Frenchman drinks. He likes to walk, ride, and swim. Even during his first term as Premier, in 1933, he would leave the office, get his bicycle, and pedal across Paris or out into the country. His chief intellectual exercise is reading, especially on military affairs and on the history of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

His wife was Mademoiselle Laffont, daughter of a scientist, who had been his *Marianne* while he was in the trenches, *Marianne* being the name given to girls back home who regularly corresponded with a soldier. Immediately after demobilization Daladier looked up this girl whose letters had helped carry him through four brutal years of war but whom he had never met. He fell in love with her and married her. Her death about eight years ago was a terrible blow

and he has been a lonely man ever since.

Edouard Daladier was born in Southern France, at Carpentras in the department of Vaucluse, in 1884. Not only was his father the village baker, and his grandfather before that; his mother too was the daughter of a baker in a neighboring village, and one of his brothers still carries on the family business. Daladier has no false pride concerning his background. He is still a frequent visitor to Vaucluse and his native village, and knows every stick, stone and person by heart.

As a young man he set out to be a teacher and was later a professor of history at the University of Grenoble and at the Lycee Condorcet in Paris. Then came 1914. Daladier was called up, and became a sergeant of *tirailleurs*, later a captain. He won the Legion of Honor and the *Croix de Guerre* with three citations.

His interest in politics dates from his youth. A few yards from the ancestral bakery was the headquarters of the local Radical-Socialist party and there he heard political talk which determined his political faith and his career. While still teaching at Grenoble he was elected Mayor of Carpentras. A Radical-Socialist in France, be it noted, is often not a radical and seldom a socialist. Rather the Radical-Socialist party, normally the most powerful in France, corresponds roughly to English Liberals or American Democrats.

The war over, Daladier turned seriously to a political career, though for some years he kept his teaching job too. He is one of the few notables in French politics who are not lawyers or journalists by profession. In 1919, aged thirty-five, he ran for the Chamber of Deputies, was elected for the Vaucluse constituency, and has been its Deputy ever since. He was a good wheelhorse; not brilliant, not eccentric, not dangerous. He continued to be the middle-of-the-road Frenchman. He was not ambitious enough to arouse jealousy in his superiors; he worked hard and was dependable for almost any kind of job.

Daladier has never been a great parliamentarian. His speeches in the Chamber are seldom as effective as those he gives in the country at large. Also, his popularity is much greater in the country than in the Parliament. Therefore, when he became Premier in April 1938, it was not surprising that he soon asked for full powers. Recently he postponed the general election from 1940 to 1942.

It would be unfair, however, to call Daladier a dictator. He is still—even in war time—the servant of the Chamber. He can at any time be dismissed from office by an adverse vote. He has made no attempt to build up a totalitarian machine, nor are the full powers granted him really exceptional. In emergencies France almost always calls for a strong hand. Poincare and Laval both governed by decree for long intervals. Daladier may be a dictator in the sense that Clemenceau was a dictator in the World War, not in the sense of Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini.

TALL, FAIR-HAIRED JOHN GUNTHER is the most valuable non-fiction property in the world. His *Inside Europe* has sold, both here and abroad, well over 500,000 copies. Though no longer an active newspaper foreign correspondent, he makes frequent trips abroad, still spending twelve to fifteen hours a day on his work. He is thirty-eight. He was born, grew up, and was educated in Chicago. His first big job was with *The Chicago Daily News* as Central European correspondent. He now lives in New York in an apartment facing Central Park. He does most of his work in a small midtown office; he has hired a secretary, though he answers phone calls himself. It is not generally known that he wrote three novels—all of them now out of print—before he tried his hand at history-in-the-making. He has an active collaborator in Frances Gunther, his wife, a talented writer and an authority on world affairs in her own right, who acts as his editor and carries a large share of the research. He has one son, John, Jr., nine, who is responsible for the suggestion out of which grew *Inside Asia*.

During his early career Daladier traveled a good deal, something that most Frenchmen don't do. In the twenties he visited the Soviet Union, Great Britain and Germany, always with an eye open for army matters. By 1923 or 1924, he had become the Radical party's best spokesman on army affairs. He cultivated the acquaintance of army officers, and was Minister of War as early as 1925. In 1933–34, when Minister of War for thirteen months, he grasped a real opportunity to overhaul the French army, revitalize it, and above all mechanize it. He is called France's best War Minister since Maginot. Maginot built the fortified line; Daladier built the tanks, the armored cars, the caterpillar trucks behind it. That the French army is today the best in Europe is partly Daladier's work.

THERE have been two supreme crises in Daladier's political life. The first came in February 1934, when he had been Premier only a few days, and when bloody rioting forced him out.

The background of this affair was the Stavisky case, the biggest scandal of the century. Sacha Stavisky was a confidence man who knew important politicians, and who killed himself (or possibly was murdered by the police) when he was found out. Various Radical politicians, not Daladier, were linked with fraudulent Stavisky enterprises. The Rightists, especially the extreme reactionaries of the Action Française, used the Stavisky scandal as a stick to beat the government with. Premier Chautemps resigned. Daladier took over. The crisis mounted fiercely. Before Daladier had warmed his office chair, mobs were gathering in the streets and on February 6, 1934, they assembled in the Place de la Concorde to attack the Chamber. Daladier had called out the Gardes Mobiles. They fired on the crowd, and seventeen were killed, with several hundred injured.

This was a tragic and shocking business. Daladier resigned without waiting for the Chamber to vote him out, because when French blood is spilled the top man pays. Daladier's justification was that if he had not dispersed the rioters by force there might have been a Fascist *coup d'etat*. He was bearing the burden of mistakes that Chautemps and others

had made. It seemed that his career was over.

But in 1935 he rose to influence again when he brought left-wing radicals into the newly formed Front Populaire. In the July 14 demonstration that summer, Daladier marched to the Bastille with Léon Blum, the leader of the Socialists, and Marcel Thorez, the Communist chieftain. This was as if Franklin Roosevelt were to celebrate Washington's Birthday by raising the clenched fist at Arlington in company with Norman Thomas and Earl Browder. Before that time the Radicals had refused any serious co-operation with the Socialists and Communists.

In the general election the following year the Leftist coalition won handsomely. The Chamber elected then rules France still. Léon Blum became Premier, with Daladier as Minister of War.

The Popular Front, under Blum, with Daladier's collaboration, lasted from June 1936 to April 1938. In twenty-two months of power it attempted to put liberalism into politics on a forceful scale. The Blum-Daladier government reduced the power of the financial oligarchy and the Bank of France, nationalized the aviation industry, co-ordinated the railways, established the forty-hour week, gave workers holidays with pay. Above all, it checked the growth of fascism. It gave France a much-needed respite from incessant turbulence and agitation by Rightist plotters.

But the Popular Front collapsed because its failures also were formidable. It had to face one of the most difficult of all questions: Can a Left government reform capitalism without abolishing it? Can a Left government function efficiently *inside* a capitalist structure? Blum as Premier was constantly perplexed by the problem of how far to go. The Communists pushed him to the Left. Daladier and the radicals held him to the Right. Therefore Blum wobbled in the middle. He outlined a tremendous program of social reform. But ultimately the budgeteers and bankers had him at their mercy; he had to have money. Moreover, his own Left let him down. He gave the trade unionists such privileges and concessions that work almost stopped. The industrial structure all but disintegrated.

Blum and Daladier were, moreover, unceasingly harried by the mounting international crisis. France needed airplanes and munitions, yet the government was shortening hours, tacitly encouraging strikes, which made efficient production on a big scale impossible. During the last six weeks of the Blum government not a single airplane was manufactured in France.

Daladier succeeded Blum as Premier in April 1938, and began a marked turn to the right. Soon after he took office the forty-hour week was, in actual practice, dropped. Daladier began to attack the Communists fiercely, and in November 1938 he crushed a general strike. In September 1939, after the Russian pact with Germany and the Russian invasion of Poland, Communist Deputies were arrested and the party suppressed.

Daladier made national defense the basic desideratum in every field. He preached national unity, national integrity, national solidarity. He said that France to survive must be strong; to be strong it must be united; to unite it became his task. And —Communists aside—he *has* united France.

But one must go back a bit to mention the other supreme crisis in Daladier's career. This was Munich. When that crisis came, in September 1938, Daladier followed Chamberlain's lead. He went to Munich, he met Hitler and Mussolini, and helped to sell Czechoslovakia out. Indeed, Daladier's behavior might be called worse than Chamberlain's. The British were not pledged to defend Czechoslovakia; the French *were*. Time and again, the French reiterated their promise to come to Czechoslovakia's aid. On July 12, Daladier himself said: "The solemn undertakings we have given to Czechoslovakia are sacred and cannot be evaded." The betrayal that came in September is one of the harshest in history.

The French have three major excuses for the Munich episode. First, that France was not in any position to face a showdown to fight. The country was pervaded with defeatism; the air force was inefficient and in bad order; the national muscles were flabby from lack of exercise. Second, French public opinion would not have supported a war. A settlement at any price was what the people wanted. They were not willing to fight even though Czechoslovakia was the heart of their security system. Third, and most important, the French had no alternative other than to follow England.

Daladier flew back to Paris after Munich, glum, despondent, and worried over France's reaction. His plane circled the airport; he saw a big crowd. He was terrified. He thought that he and his advisers might be mobbed. Memories of the February sixth riots came to mind. He braced himself, wondered if the *Gardes Mobiles* would be there to protect him, and stepped off the plane. To his amazement he was greeted with a wild ovation and led in triumph to the Chamber.

It is difficult to sum up the sources of Daladier's power. He is no genius. He is no demagogue. He lacks magnetism or political "oomph." He is no titan, no born leader of men. He is certainly not a "great" man, as Clemenceau was. Probably he is not even as strong a man as Poincare. But he speaks the language of the average Frenchman; that is his secret. Like the average Frenchman, he is resilient, an individualist, shrewd, not particularly ambitious, packed with common sense, rational, and moderate. He has the incomparable advantage of being archtypical of the people he represents. Therefore the people like and trust him. They understand his every accent. He is one of them.

I asked one of his best friends what Daladier's central faith was, what he believed in most. The answer came, "Three things." I asked what they were. "France. The small man. And himself."

MILES VAUGHN

IV. The Sino-Japanese Front

▶▶ If Japan is drawn into the European conflict the danger of American involvement may become acute

"THE *European war story is not, for Americans, the most important news story now running in the papers. The Japanese war story is. . . .*

"If we have any native sense at all, and if we learned anything from the one time we mixed into a European war, we'll resist to the end the temptation to send over another A.E.F. And we won't lose sight for a moment of what Japan is doing in China. . . .

"Japan, in short, is doing the same thing Russia is doing. Japan is utilizing the war in Europe to get things it wants in Asia. Those things include the freezing out of British, French and American business in China, and the uprooting of British and French military power in China.

"After that, what?

"Well, Chiang can probably hold on for a while. But, with all his pipelines for Occidental war materials cut, as all of them bid fair to be before long, it is hard to see how he can win . . .

"With China subjugated the sky will be the limit to Japan's ambitions . . . So it is up to us to keep our eyes on Japan; and to keep ourselves armed with a possible Japanese war always in view; and to do what we can to stymie Japan at every opportunity."

THESE excerpts from a recent editorial in *The Daily News*, New York, represent an increasingly widespread American viewpoint towards the turbulent Orient.

Are they justified? If they are, what will the new year bring forth?

To students of Oriental politics the outlook for 1940 is anything but reassuring. Its backdrop is an ominous series of developments which include:

(1) Frequent anti-foreign outbursts in China since white men first penetrated the boundaries of old Cathay. These outbursts were most intense during the so-called Boxer Rebellion and the siege of the Legation Quarter in Peking in 1900 and widespread attacks on Occidentals during the Chinese Nationalist revolution which, in 1927, led an American warship to fire on Chinese troops when the Nationalists captured Nanking. There have been numerous attacks on Britons and Americans during the present Chinese-Japanese conflict, some by Japanese and others by Chinese allegedly inspired by Japanese "Ronin"—as the Japanese civilian agents of the Imperial Army in China are called.

(2) Increasing Japanese military penetration of China and official announcement by the Japanese Premier, General Nobuyuki Abe, of a plan to set up a new Japan-sponsored "central" government of China in Nanking under the former Chinese Premier Wang Ching-wei. This penetration has meant bringing many communication lines in China under Japanese control and has given the Japanese a weapon with which, if they desire, foreign trade in the so-called "occupied" areas of China can be strangled. Japan today is in control of the eastern half of China—the area in which the trade, cultural, and political interests of the United States always have been concentrated.

(3) Recent abrogation—effective January 26, 1940—of the Japanese-American commercial treaty, the basic agreement between our country and Japan, by the Roosevelt Administration. This treaty covers virtually all relations between Japan and the United States. If it is not renewed, Japanese ships will find it virtually impossible to enter American ports and American ships presumably will have to quit calling at Japanese ports; American citizens resident in Japan will be affected as well as Japanese resident in the United States; the United States will stand to lose an estimated $230,000,000 a year in foreign trade and her third largest customer among the nations of the world.

The big fact that will influence the Far East in 1940, however, is the European war. That struggle already is spreading and, in the opinion of most students, there is a strong possibility that it will enter the Far East during the coming year. If it does Japan may have to abandon the "hands off" policy she declared towards the European conflict when it started. And if Japan enters the great war repercussions in the United States are certain, for we have not only our interests in China to protect but also the Philippines.

Japan has the third largest navy and one of the most powerful armies in the world. Her air force rates high. Should she throw her weight on the side of Germany and Russia, obviously, the Allies would be in danger of defeat. During the World War, it must be remembered, Japan was on the side of Britain and France and her navy did yeoman service in keeping open London's food line to Australia. And American opinion, if it follows past patterns, would be tremendously affected.

To imagine what we might do one has only to recall the attitude of our people toward the Italian conquest of Ethiopia, the German absorption of Czechoslovakia and the German-Russian partition of Poland, toward the Chinese-Japanese war and toward the Russian invasion of Finland.

Hence what Japan decides to do

MILES VAUGHN, Night News Manager of the United Press, has been a newspaper man for twenty-five years. His first experience was with Kansas newspapers, among them *The Kansas City Star*. He became affiliated with the United Press during the World War, serving as bureau manager in St. Louis, Kansas City, Dallas, and New York. When America entered the war, he served in the Navy and was editor of *The Great Lakes Bulletin*, daily newspaper of the Great Lakes training station. After the war he rejoined the United Press, serving on the Mexican border during the civil war period of 1919. Vaughn went to the Far East in 1924 to organize the United Press service in the Orient, remaining there for ten years. While in the Orient he was married to an American girl; both their children, a boy and a girl, were born there. He is the author of *Covering the Far East*—the autobiography of a foreign correspondent. The Vaughns live in Pelham Manor in Westchester, New York.

with regard to the European war is of the utmost importance to us.

The Japanese never have said they will not enter the European conflict. Instead, the Japanese Premier and his associates repeatedly have asserted, Japan has one cardinal point in her foreign policy. That point is to end the China war in a satisfactory manner as soon as possible. The "satisfactory" manner, it has been made clear, must include the elimination of China's Nationalist Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, and his immediate supporters, and his replacement by a regime pledged to friendship for Japan.

One must judge all the actions of the Japanese government in its international relations in the light of this cardinal point, which already has had an effect on Japanese-American relations.

To Americans, it would seem, the question is how this Japanese point can be squared with our other foreign relations.

It may be assumed that most Americans do not want Japan to enter the European war against the Allies or to make a deal with Russia for the partition of China, as has been suggested in Moscow and Berlin.

And the present government in Tokyo does not want to make any deal with Russia regarding China and does not want to enter the European conflict.

But it does want to succeed in China.

Success of the China program, indeed, has become a matter of life or death for the Empire. Emperor Hirohito personally has approved the Imperial war aims. There will be no turning back.

But just what is Japan's China program, in detail?

In two and a half years, Japan has nibbled off less than one-third of the Chinese Republic.

So far nobody knows. Premier Abe has said that the program rests on a declaration made by Prince Konoye in December, 1937, in which the Prince, then Premier, laid down some rather vague principles including statements that Japan wants no indemnities from China, will annex no Chinese territory, and wants merely Chinese friendship and cooperation.

She apparently wants no formal peace treaty with China but would prefer to see Wang Ching-wei's regime proclaimed and then let events take their course, relying on Japanese military, commercial and political ability eventually to draw the five northern Chinese provinces into a Japan-China-Manchukuo political and economic bloc and to improve Japan's position in central and south China. Tokyo also would like to keep Hainan Island, which already has been appropriated by the Imperial Navy and made a part of the Administration of Formosa, whose governor always is an admiral on the inactive list.

The Japanese, themselves, have had a hard time deciding what they want in China. Until the present Chinese-Japanese war started, their desires were clear. They wanted Manchuria —which they took in the undeclared wars of 1932–33—Inner Mongolia, and a dominant position in China's five northern provinces. They had no particular ambitions in the rest of China, although a comparatively small section of the Navy always had liked to toy with the idea of control of Hainan.

The reason they wanted the North Asian areas was their fear of Russia, with which they were constantly quarreling.

Control of Manchuria (now Manchukuo), Inner Mongolia, and China north of the northern watershed of the Yellow River, was believed essential to offset Russian control of Outer Mongolia and the Soviet action in making Vladivostok, which is within easy aerial bombing range of Japan proper, into a great fortified port.

For more than 25 years Russia was Japan's potential enemy. Japanese soldiers were trained almost exclusively in preparation for a Russian war to be fought in northern Asia. The first war plan of the General Staff, a plan which was revised yearly, was directed against Russia. The Japanese saw all their future in terms of northern Asia and Russia as their only potential antagonist.

Long before other nations they guessed, correctly, that Bolshevist Russia eventually would embark on a policy of expansion similar to that of the Czars. They saw Russian absorption of Outer Mongolia in 1924–25 as a signal that Communism was marching eastward just as Czarism had marched. They saw Russian domination of the Chinese Nationalist Revolution from 1924 to 1928 as the beginning of an effort to Sovietize China.

The Japanese did not want, and they tried to avoid, the present undeclared war with China. They wanted control of Inner Mongolia and China's five northern provinces but they hoped to achieve this goal without war.

The fact that war came, they assert, is Russia's fault. Russian Communists, working with the Chi-

nese Communist Party, they believe, planned the kidnaping of Generalissimo Chiang at Sian-fu, capital of Shensi Province, and forced him to agree, before he was released, to form the "All-China Anti-Japanese Front" and to fight when Chinese and Japanese troops clashed outside Peiping in the famous Lukuochiao incident.

Into this picture, too, must be fitted the anti-Comintern agreement between Japan and Germany to which Italy and other nations also adhered. Tokyo saw this agreement as a foundation on which could be erected an edifice of loose alliances which would surround Russia with anti-Comintern nations and prevent Russian expansion.

Berlin saw the agreement as preliminary to a German-Japanese military alliance. The Germans knew they wanted to expand and they knew expansion might lead to war. And, naturally, they wanted Japan on their side. As events worked out, however, the Germans found themselves suddenly in partnership with Russia and Japan all but denounced the anti-Comintern agreement because of the Russo-German non-aggression treaty.

The Japanese moved cautiously, however, and in the end the anti-Comintern agreement was not terminated. Tokyo decided that it would be useful to keep a line tied to Berlin, no matter how tenuous it might be, and to preserve collaboration with Italy. The reason for this decision was the China war.

Britain, the United States, France and Russia all had been giving a measure of support to China while Germany and Italy had been giving a measure of support—chiefly moral—to Japan. The Japanese, despite their indignation at what they termed Germany's bad faith in making an agreement with Russia, realized they still needed all the support they could get if they were to win their China conflict.

Material support for China from London and Paris stopped when the European war started but a measure of diplomatic support remained and Tokyo wanted that publicly disclaimed American support for the Chinese was increasing, as indicated by President Roosevelt's action in abrogating the Japanese-American treaty. So Japan decided to maintain close contact with Berlin and to reinforce her position there by replacing Ambassador Oshima, who had been a strong proponent of a German-Japanese military alliance, with an experienced career diplomat, Saburo Kurusu.

Kurusu, like every other Japanese diplomat, knows that the Empire has one overwhelming desire—to end the China war as soon as possible in at least a partial victory. His job is to use German-Japanese relations as best he can to further that aim.

In London Japan is represented by one of the ablest of her diplomats, Mamoru Shigemitsu, former vice minister for foreign affairs and a career man who has seen long service. His job also is to use Anglo-Japanese relations to further the cardinal point in Japanese foreign policy.

American relations have been handled largely in Tokyo, where the United States is represented by Ambassador Joseph C. Grew who deals directly with Foreign Minister Nomura, while his chief assistant, Embassy Counsellor Eugene Dooman, deals with the chief of the American section of the Imperial Foreign Office.

Russian relations are conducted alternately in Moscow and in Tokyo since neither side is willing they be concentrated in the capital of the other.

RUSSIAN Foreign Affairs Commissar V. M. Molotov has made it clear that he wants an accord with Japan. Soon after the European war started, he agreed to a "cease fighting" agreement on the frontier between Russia's Outer Mongolian protectorate and Japan's Manchukuoan dependency, where Soviet and Japanese troops had been in bitter conflict over a boundary dispute. He then proposed a settlement of all pending Russo-Japanese differences and the signature of a trade treaty, and did not challenge repeated reports from Berlin that a Russo-Japanese non-aggression treaty, presumably on the Russo-German model, could be expected.

Japan received the Soviet olive branch with one hand extended and the other on the sword. It was admitted in Tokyo that Russia could do more than any other power to assure an immediate Japanese victory in China, because Russia was the only power giving the Chinese real military support—the men, guns, airplanes and supplies which Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek must have—but Tokyo was not yet ready to go the whole way and sign a non-aggression treaty, with all the international implications such a move would involve.

The Japanese would like Russia to stop giving support to China but they are not willing, now, to purchase Russian cooperation with any pledge which would give Russia additional spheres of influence in Asia. So long as the domination of Asia must be split, the Japanese prefer that Britain, France, China and the United States remain in the picture. They do not want Russian strength increased for fear that, in time, it might surpass their own.

Another factor that has restrained the Japanese from further moves toward Berlin and Moscow is the Japanese economic set up. Japan is primarily a sea power and her natural relations, economically as well as politically, are with Britain and the United States. The old Anglo-Japanese alliance dominated Japanese thinking on foreign affairs for a quarter of a century and its influence still is strong. Japanese-American commercial relations are of paramount importance.

London and Washington are, of course, completely familiar with Japan's problems. They would like to limit Japan's gains in China but they do not want the present comparatively moderate Japanese Cabinet kicked out by the extreme militarists and replaced with one that might put Japan in the European war on the side of Germany and Russia.

So what to do?

Britain, devoting her every energy to the European war, largely has left the problem to the United States and the picture of Far Eastern events in 1940 may be largely a picture of how Washington meets the situation. So far the United States has supported China through our silver purchase policy.

Ambassador Grew was in Washington last summer and talked over the situation at length with the President and Secretary of State Hull. When he returned to Tokyo he told the Japanese, "straight from the horse's mouth," that Americans do not approve of many of the acts of the Japanese armed forces in China. It probably was the frankest speech ever made by an American envoy to Nippon and the Japanese had no choice but to receive it gracefully. Foreign Minister Nomura invited the Ambassador into a series of conferences, ostensibly to discuss some agreement which would prevent the losses which would follow a "no treaty" period after the Japanese-American treaty lapses, but probably, in reality, to go over the whole field of Japanese-American relations.

The Foreign Minister was conciliatory. He agreed that Japan would pay for all damages she has done to American property in China and would respect all American rights, in so far as "military necessity" would permit. He was adamant, however, on the point of Japan's "special position" in East Asia.

While these conversations were under way, the Tokyo press suddenly began emphasizing Russo-Japanese negotiations, declaring that, if the United States, acting as a "British cat's-paw," tries to stop Japan in China, Japan will have no choice but to come to an agreement with Russia.

There the situation rests. What happens in the Far East in 1940 will depend on how the complicated threads in this tangled skein unwind. China is not going to have much to do with how her fate is decided. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has lost most of his reliable communication lines and the best of his territory. His "All-China" front, never too strong since it was composed of groups which had clashed for years, is under constant pressure. But the Generalissimo has pulled out of tough situations before and nobody who knows him would be willing to call him a defeated man until he has played his last card.

CARLETON BEALS

V. Latin America and the War

▶▶ The Good Neighbors offer opportunities in trade but Uncle Sam should be prepared to reciprocate

DURING the present European war, as during the World War, the Latin American market—because Europe cannot export in quantity—is likely to be handed to us on a silver platter. The buying power of Latin American countries will probably expand, and our shipments south will correspondingly increase. Certainly it is fortunate that many of our vessels can go into southern trade to take up the slack of lost European and Asiatic markets.

But it is well to remember that this is an artificial development due more to historical accident than to normal needs or our own initiative. The important question is to what extent this trade can be put upon a fairly permanent basis. And this is but part of the larger question of whether we can help build a real community of nations in the Western Hemisphere.

At present, the incentive to create such a community, based on fair-play, is strong. Strife in Asia and Europe is creating special relationships among the twenty-one American republics. Bonds severed with Europe mean new ties among the American peoples. As during and after the World War, the United States and Latin America are being forced into closer economic, political and cultural alignments.

But with this difference: in 1914 we were unprepared for the new responsibilities thrust upon us as a member of the fraternity of western nations; today we have a world of experience behind us, are better able to map our course.

In 1914 we did not have a cable network to all Latin America. None of our large news agencies maintained offices in South America. News from the southern countries mostly went via London, was sifted through the British censorship, then came back garbled to New York. In 1914 there was scarcely any American merchant marine in southern waters. In that year our exports to South America totalled only a little more than $100,000,000. There have been years since when we have sold more than that to Cuba alone. Our information, our diplomacy, our banking services, our commercial relationships were limited and faulty.

Today our cable network is complete. Our news services, though hard-pressed by subsidized news dished out by official European agencies, have been able to maintain their footing. Today we have a large merchant marine plowing across the equator. Pan American Airways has developed fine fast service, which despite subsidized German, Italian and French competition, has continuously improved. Our banking system has expanded. Our business men, though we lack the fine training schools for Latin American service maintained by the Germans, have learned a great deal about southern trade and political practices. Many now speak Spanish or Portuguese.

In 1914 our diplomatic relations were in a confused state. Our legations were dumping grounds for lame-duck politicians and wealthy campaign contributors. Our national policy fluctuated wildly among the apparently irreconcilable needs of trade and friendship, capital investment and debt collections.

Our neighbor republics viewed us with suspicion. Their press dripped with denunciations of our imperial-

ism and of the Monroe Doctrine. The Latin American intelligentsia baited United Sam as "the Colossus of the North."

But a new course was eventually charted. President Coolidge appointed Ambassador Dwight W. Morrow to Mexico in 1927. Morrow left the big stick north of the Rio Grande and soon obtained more concessions than we had obtained by years of intervention and threats. The shift to a friendly policy was quickened when President Hoover withdrew the marines from Nicaragua and promised to withdraw them from Haiti. President Roosevelt sensed the full possibilities, and with a dramatic flourish converted the more liberal attitude into a state doctrine—the good-neighbor policy.

POLICY and declarations were supported by positive acts: the abolition of the Platt Amendment, ending our legal protectorate over Cuba; a new treaty with Panama; the attempt to solve the Mexican oil controversy without armed intervention. The change has been reflected in Pan-American congresses, which have built up a new body of international law and, with our consent, have outlawed the use of force to settle international disputes. Meanwhile, the caliber of our diplomatic representatives has steadily improved. Today many men in the service are really trained in Latin American affairs.

A few black marks have been chalked up on the policy. In several instances, dollar diplomacy has apparently persisted. The navigation treaty sought from Cuba has aroused antagonism because of its allegedly one-sided terms. The recent fêting in Washington of Somoza of Nicaragua and Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, and our support of Vargas in Brazil, have a reminiscent savor. Our promotion of armaments in Latin America and our new government loans to some of the southern governments (whatever the apparent necessity of the arrangements) apparently mirrored a failure to take realistic measures to combat German trade and totalitarian influence. But by and large the worthy achievements of the good-neighbor policy far outweigh its deficiencies.

One of the really great assets of the new situation is our wider knowledge of and interest in our southern neighbors. In 1914 few courses in Latin American subjects were given in our universities. Today the vogue for such courses is spreading even to our smallest institutions. Students are thus provided with a life-long interest. Cultural intercourse is not easily directed in new channels, but the United States has really responded to the new developments with remarkable alertness. In Latin America, too, students more and more are turning to the United States, especially in technical matters, instead of to the Old World.

All this represents the coming of age of the Western Hemisphere, a tendency to look at problems in the light of native potentialities. It all helps to promote a self-reliant New World system.

Our experiences in economic matters have their rueful side. From the World War on, just as our guns and marines went south, so did our dollars, our engineers, and our traders. Our investments in prosperity days were estimated to have reached the grand total of $6,000,000,000 and surpassed those of England in most Latin American countries. From 1920 to 1929, our exports to Latin America averaged over $1,000,000,000 annually and at times came close to $2,000,000,000—more than we sold to the whole world in 1931 and 1932. We came to hold the lion's share of the southern market, and for much of Latin America we were the major outlet.

Argentine President Ortiz

We met competition with a deluge of golden dollars. We loaned Latin America vast sums, drowned out its protests over our interventions with apparently inexhaustible credits. We provided it with ever increasing funds to buy our goods.

BUT in 1931, instead of selling it nearly $2,000,000,000 worth of goods, we sold it only about $200,000,000 worth. In 1934 we sold less to all of South America than we had to Cuba and Mexico back in 1909, 35 years earlier. And so our gains were wiped out. Our depression was upon us, and along with trade collapse, our complicated loan structure crumpled. At a time when credit was most needed, we could give no more.

The effect on most of Latin America was catastrophic. Chile at the time was sending sixty per cent of her national production into world commerce. The collapse of the American market cast her into economic disaster. Political upheaval followed upheaval; government followed government.

The Latin American countries had been putting the bulk of their trade into one basket—the American market. When it vanished, they were left with vast supplies of raw materials. Brazil burned coffee. Cuba packed sugar into warehouses. Chile instituted rigid controls over the nitrate

FOR YEARS CARLETON BEALS has been telling people that they were underestimating the importance of our Good Neighbors. He became a one-man information bureau about Latin America, writing books about its countries individually and collectively. Today the war in Europe has proved him right. South America *has* become of vital concern to the United States; it is one of the big stakes in this war. With German shipping swept off the seas, the United States has an opportunity to repair its Latin-American trade and good-will fences, dented in recent years by Germany's persistent efforts.

Beals' knowledge of the Americas is not limited to the Good Neighbors; he knows the United States thoroughly, has traveled the country extensively. He was born in Kansas forty-six years ago, grew up in California, lives today in northern Connecticut. Last year he wrote *American Earth*, a new, intelligent approach to the most fundamental of all American problems—the disappearing wealth of our land. Beals is sandy-haired, blue-eyed. He is soft-spoken and mild mannered but loves a good fight. He has written almost two dozen books, most of them about Latin America.

and mining industries. Bolivia began regulating the tin industry until now all mining is, in everything except name, a governmental monopoly. Argentina worked hard toward greater self-sufficiency. Practically all countries went off the gold standard, set up managed currencies and exchange controls, and instituted subsidies and quota systems.

They sought frantically for new places to sell their products and found them in the totalitarian powers, countries also without credit, countries not hampered by a complicated financial and loan structure. The barter system was born. The Aski mark system was born. The Japanese ten-year Latin American trade program was born. Italy began bartering airplanes and machinery for coffee and wheat, wool and oil. Concurrently England, caught in the nutcracker of depression, began emphasizing her policy of trading within the empire. She bought less from Latin America, and her exports fell off correspondingly. By the outbreak of the present war in Europe, Germany was outselling England in every important Latin American country except Argentina; she had been outselling the United States in Brazil, where England had dropped to fourth place; she was forging up close to us in Chile, Salvador, Uruguay and a number of other countries.

Just as our aggressiveness during the boom had fanned the fires of Communism to the South, so now our depression and the chaos it brought provided fertile fields for Fascist and Nazi ideologies. Totalitarian propaganda made headway behind the bulwarks of barter trade.

Nevertheless, the Latin American market is largely ours again. Historical accident gives us another chance. Doubtless many of our merchants will gladly skim the cream off the situation. As of old, many will use Latin America as a quick dumping ground for surplus products. But probably most business men hope that trade gains, so far as possible, will be put upon a permanent, normal basis. We are a bit wary of easy war expansion. If trade is again raised to unduly high levels, we may again go into a tail spin.

But normal expansion of our trade with Latin America is not easy to achieve. In many lines southern production competes with ours. During the depression, Latin American economies more and more dovetailed with those of European and Asiatic powers. We do not want Argentine wheat dumped into Minnesota. We do not want Brazil's cheap cotton in South Carolina.

If our trade is to reach a higher level on the basis of a healthy exchange of goods, new methods, patient experimentation and a long-range policy will be necessary. It will also be necessary to abandon many cherished American practices.

For a quick pick-up the easy solution is to extend credits. But loan pump-priming, which we practiced so lavishly following the World War, is precisely the best way to defeat any permanent gain. The present trend to substitute government lending for private lending to countries in default is an opportunistic course that will bring us no lasting benefits. To provide the southern countries with the money to buy our goods will mean a dissipation of American wealth without corresponding benefits on either side.

We have spilled American wealth across the oceans for paper promises to pay—paper scarcely worth its own weight. To that extent the American standard of living has been lowered and our national debt has been increased. Furthermore, those promises to pay block commercial operations everywhere. In Latin America we want our billions repaid. As things stand, they can't be repaid. But those outstanding obligations hinder the reorganization of trade.

We still refuse to accept the elementary truth that, if we sell people goods, we must take other goods in exchange. We now take gold and silver. The gold is dug up in the British Empire and the Urals, shipped across the sea, and buried in Kentucky. The products of American labor have paid for that gold. We are gambling that it will be worth to our children what we paid for it. But so far as the American standard of living is concerned, it is largely just another promise to pay in the future.

Hence the new government loan policy to Latin America is full of pitfalls. To hand over the money of American taxpayers to defaulted southern countries is suicidal. It probably means eventual loss of the money, and the type of trade promoted cannot survive. We made those loans because reciprocal trade treaties we sponsored were not bringing desired results and because certain Latin American rulers were flirting with Hitler and Mussolini. But we cannot buy friendship. Our monetary outlay may well have promoted German trade as much as our own.

The only way to put our Latin American trade on

South American Primer, by Katherine Carr

a sound basis is to take Latin American goods. Secretary Hull's reciprocity treaties should have been coupled with a full program of trade promotion. Instead they were merely another theoretical "ism" lulling us into the belief that they would do more than they could. Actually they are based on a theory of free, unrestricted world trade, a condition that has scarcely existed since long before the first World War, and which is not likely to exist for generations to come. Mr. Hull has been playing croquet on a field of charging football players.

Modern trade controls range from complete nationalization, as in Russia and Germany, through quotas, subsidies, long-time warehousing, barter and other devices more potent than any reciprocity treaty—not to mention war and force. Tariffs are but a minor item today. Such efforts as our sugar quota to Cuba, our silver purchases from Mexico, our diplomatic efforts to abolish rigid quotas, have often been more effective than our reciprocity treaties.

The best bet for a sound exchange of goods with Latin America lies in promoting the purchase there of key strategic materials which we do not have in the United States or do not have in sufficient quantities—rubber, sugar, coffee, camphor, quinine, cocaine, opium, tin, platinum, manganese, nickel, chromium, mercury, industrial diamonds, hemp, fibres, waxes, iodine, tungsten—things necessary if our industry is to remain efficient and indispensable for our national defense. Many of these materials are now tight-fisted monopolies of the English, Dutch, Russians and Japanese, and we pay through the nose for them. Why should we rely on platinum from the Soviet Union when it can be obtained from Brazil and Colombia? Why should we rely on the British-Dutch monopoly of tin, when we can get it from Bolivia?

The directing of our purchases toward Latin America requires a program based on more than one year's balance sheet. It requires the return of confidence to American industry, so that our normal powerful buying power abroad can reassert itself. It requires the greater organization of that buying power to further national interests. We are the one great nation in the world which has not so utilized its buying power.

Take Uruguay. Before the present

(Continued on page 64)

LINDSAY ROGERS

VI. American Politics in High Gear

▶▶The presidential campaigns are under way in what may be a peak year on the political front

During the last war I heard a speaker begin an address with this astonishing sentence: "What a wonderful era of peace this would be if the great World War were not in progress!" For days thereafter some who had been in his audience greeted each other with mocking imitations: What a beautiful day this would be if it were not raining! How well I should feel if I were not thoroughly tired out!

The banality comes to my mind when I reflect on the immediate political outlook in the United States. What the political future holds will be influenced by the fact that much of Europe is in a state of war whose repercussions on us will be more and more serious. Will we be able to stay out? That seems far more likely than it did a few weeks ago for the reason that the war is the kind of war it is.

Instead of huge bombing operations and mass battles, we have sparring for points while economic pressure takes its toll and each warring government endeavors to keep its national morale from cracking first. Hence there is less emotional tension in the United States. Our neutrality legislation, even though it has serious gaps which Congress will debate filling, should make few in number the "incidents" that might inflame American public opinion. There was little partisanship in our recent neutrality debates. Perhaps in the next few months party politics can be stopped at the water's edge.

Economic consequences already visible will become painful slowly. Neutrals are learning the high cost of maintaining neutrality. We face a loss of exports to Germany and the northern neutrals which in 1938 amounted to $400,000,000. Our $650,000,000 of exports to Great Britain and France will be vastly changed in character. There seems little likelihood of any great war boom, and the boomlet we now enjoy may vanish completely by the spring. Meanwhile opportunities of increased trade with South America will be explored but few unknown bonanzas will be discovered. Attacks on Secretary Hull's reciprocal tariff program will increase and many will preach greater economic self-sufficiency for the United States.

The coming year is a presidential one. In 1940 the United States must go through the quadrennial civil war which we deem to be necessary to elect a president. From one standpoint that war is continuous. President Roosevelt began to wage it on behalf of himself in 1930 when he was re-elected governor of New York by a large majority. Since 1933, he has been waging it on behalf of the New Deal. In 1936 he defeated the enemy in a second major engagement and his every move now looks to 1940. As yet he has not disclosed whether he will participate as the leader—whether he will seek a third term.

Within his general staff there are those who would like to succeed to his post. The two aspirants chiefly discussed are the Vice-President of the United States, John N. Garner, and the ex-governor of Indiana, ex-president of the American Legion, ex-governor general of the Philippines and present Federal Security Administrator—Paul V. McNutt. If the troops should nominate one whom he approved, President Roosevelt may

choose not to run, but it is doubtful whether he could bring himself to approve either of the chief contenders. If President Roosevelt should decide to run again other aspirants would have to submit, for the troops know that if they forced him to retire they could not win. Perhaps a "dark horse" will emerge.

As yet President Roosevelt refuses to say what he intends to do. If he announced his retirement, his influence would be largely gone. If he announced definitely that he did not intend to retire, he would precipitate a bitter controversy over the third term tradition. The longer he is noncommittal, the less bitter will be this issue if he should decide that he wants to raise it. The long-standing possibility of a third term candidacy has reconciled the Democratic party to it and has made the country less affrighted of it. More and more people are realizing that the tradition was established in a day when the electoral college was something more than the rubber stamp which popular election has made it. Successive choices of a "best man" by "the best men"—which was the intention of the Founding Fathers—might have had elements of danger to republican government. A popular vote approving a third term is a different matter.

Even though battle will not be joined for ten months more, the Republicans have been scouting and skirmishing. Several hats are in the ring. Three contenders have special prominence — Senators Vandenberg of Michigan and Taft of Ohio, and District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey of New York City. A few weeks ago Mr. Dewey began to flirt with the agricultural vote. Taunted by his silence on national issues he made a speech in Minneapolis against "economic defeatism"—an attitude reminiscent of President Coolidge's description of a sermon on sin. Asked what the preacher had said about sin, Mr. Coolidge replied: "He was ag'in it." Well, in his first scouting effort Mr. Dewey was against economic defeatism and buttressed his case by quotations from the wrong William Pitt and from a report of United States Commissioner of Labor for 1886 which had been read and reread by President Roosevelt's supporters in the 1932 campaign: "It is true that the discovery of new processes of manufacture will undoubtedly continue, but it will not leave room for a marked extension such as has been witnessed during the last fifty years."

Each candidate has his supporters, but none has caused any wild enthusiasm. Mark Sullivan, Washington correspondent, who wants to see a Republican victory, reports "the common judgment" that Mr. Dewey's radio presence is "extremely effective." He has "most of the elements of charm of voice that Mr. Roosevelt has, and in addition a deeper resonance and strength, a result perhaps of his relative youth. In this respect as in others, Mr. Dewey's youth may be an asset to him rather than a disadvantage." Fifty years ago in *The American Commonwealth* Lord Bryce wrote a famous chapter entitled "Why Great Men Are Not Chosen Presidents." He declared that "when the choice lies between a brilliant man and a safe man, the safe man is preferred. Party feeling strong enough to carry in on its own back a man without conspicuous positive merits is not always strong enough to procure forgiveness for a man with positive faults." Since this was written some brilliant men have been President, but the safe man is still preferred. Now, apparently, along with "safety" and residence in a doubtful state, a mellifluous voice is to be considered as qualifying one for the most powerful elective office in the world.

Soon the candidates who are now scouting must begin to skirmish—eight months in advance of the battle. That is what our electoral timetable calls for. Of course it is absurd that our formal presidential struggle is so long drawn out. Great Britain can decide to have an election, dissolve the House of Commons, nominate candidates, and have the new House assemble within six weeks.

But in the United States delegates to the nominating conventions will

begin to be chosen in March. On the second Tuesday of that month the eyes of the nation will be on New Hampshire which will hold a presidential primary. From then until shortly before the conventions there will be voting on and bickering over the individuals who are to choose the candidates. During the entire period the candidates themselves will be active.

Recently there have been proposals to "shorten the election campaign." The only result of that would be postponement of the nominating conventions until, say, August or September, and about the only effect of this would be to reduce the time in which the nominees could travel and could purchase radio facilities. It would shorten the period during which the emotional heat of the electorate can reach its height. Moreover, we would have fewer polls of samples of the electorate and assurances that "scientific analysis" was forecasting accurately how different states and the country as a whole would vote. A shortening of the campaign which would produce only these results does not seem very important.

During presidential campaigns the discussion of issues generates more heat than light. There is always a tendency to subordinate real issues. Party platforms straddle. Voters become emotional, but that is principally because they are choosing between persons or between parties and not because they are weighing proposed courses of action.

Both platforms will asseverate a strong desire to remain at peace. Both will call for an army, a navy and an air force adequate for national defense but no larger. Before the platforms can be adopted, Congress will have approved greatly increased

military and naval appropriations. Neither party will discuss the fact that in the United States there is no correlation between our foreign policy and armament programs. Neither party will suggest that perhaps better defense could be secured by a shrewder and strategically sounder parcelling out of the appropriated sums between different defense arms. In the United States there is less civilian control of military policy than in any other democratic country. Save for the moments that the President can spare for his duties as commander-in-chief there are no opportunities for coordination of defense plans. Neither party will discuss this important matter.

The Republican platform will be eloquent on the necessity of eliminating governmental extravagances, reducing the deficit and balancing the budget. It will not give any details of the way in which the budget could be balanced. It will not propose new taxes or indicate specific economies that should be effected. As a matter of fact, there are only two functions in which great savings could be made —defense and relief. On railroads—the failure of the New Deal to present a program on them is a grave sin of omission—on agricultural policy, revision of the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and similar questions, the platforms will straddle.

To an extent such straddling is essential to the democratic process. Voters can become heated over personalities or parties and consent to lose peacefully. They realize that the behavior of the winners will not be radically different from the behavior of their own leaders had they been successful. On real issues of policy there must be a good deal of mental lethargy during campaigns. If the voters were not lethargic those who

were put into the minority might not be so willing to accept defeat.

Nor will there be an issue over retaining or abandoning what are denounced as New Deal experiments. The Republicans are not likely to propose relaxing, much less repealing, the Securities Exchange legislation. The national government, no matter who heads it, will not retrace its steps in the field of social security. In one of his *Federalist* papers, Alexander Hamilton expressed the opinion that "to reverse and undo what has been done by a predecessor is very often considered by a successor as the best proof he can give of his own capacity and desert." If a Republican administration comes into power, or if the Democrats elect a President who is not enamoured of the New Deal, the new President will not attempt thus to demonstrate his own capacity. There will be little undoing. There may be some contraction and a temporary moratorium on further experiment, but that is all.

Even here, the Republican platform will not be frank. Andre Siegfried, generalizing on French character, said that a "Frenchman wears his heart on the Left and his pocket on the Right." The heart desired measures of reform—measures which required expense which emptied the pocket. As a result, reaction was inevitable. Heart beats were not heeded until pockets were replenished. For this, among other reasons, there has been in French politics what M. Siegfried describes as a pendulum swinging along a narrow arc from Left to Right and from Right to Left.

At the moment, the American temper is probably ready for a swing of the pendulum toward the Right—that is, for the replenishment of the pocket. But no political party would be likely to go to the country on this issue and say frankly: "We do not propose to undo anything which has been done. We simply propose to do it much better and more economically. We propose to concentrate on more efficient housekeeping in the households already set up and to establish no new ones. We will replenish the pocket so the heart can beat again."

If it argued this way, the opposition might find the Achilles heel of the New Deal but it would be a heel in which there was scant public interest. There is room for argument over the wisdom or unwisdom of fiscal policies and of legislative measures that impinge on economic life. But who can maintain that administration has been as efficient as it should have been? In respect of some activities, inefficiency has been notorious: the National Recovery Administration (in its later stages), the Communications Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority (in respect of its internal operations), the Coal Commission and now the Wagner Labor Relations Board.

The government's spending was done with little coordination. Not infrequently the chief spenders—Messrs. Hopkins and Ickes—quarrelled publicly over their respective spheres of influence. That the New Deal should have devoted greater attention to efficient administration no one will dare to deny. Only by achieving efficiency can representative government remain representative. But there is little likelihood that politicians or electorates will take this matter to heart.

One thing, however, is certain. The gentleman who occupies the White House from 1941 to 1945 will hardly have the "bully time" which Theodore Roosevelt undoubtedly had and which

(Continued on page 64)

PROFESSOR LINDSAY ROGERS, since 1929 Burgess professor of public law at Columbia University, knows politics as a student and teacher and as one who has been on the inside. He was Deputy Administrator of the N.R.A., chairman of the Board of Labor Review of the Works Progress Administration. During the World War, he served on the General Staff Corps, and in 1918 was affiliated with the United States Tariff Commission. He was born in Baltimore in 1891, grew up there, graduating from Baltimore City College and receiving his doctorate at Johns Hopkins. He became a newspaper reporter for six years but left to teach political science at the University of Virginia.

After the war, he taught and lectured on public law and political science at Harvard, Johns Hopkins, University of Southern California, and Amherst. He has written a half dozen books and is editor of the Knopf series of Political Science Classics. He has been associate editor of the *American Political Science Quarterly* since 1921. Professor Rogers is married, lives in New York.

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

VII. Democracy on the Defensive

▶▶ Democracy has no ironclad guarantee for its survival but must continually fortify itself

OVERHEARD on almost any street corner of America today:

"Thank God, I am an American!"

"Boy, it's great to live in a democracy and have three thousand miles of ocean between us and Europe!"

"I am in favor of building the biggest navy in the world and letting the rest of the nations go to the dogs if they want to. Let's keep America for Americans!"

These curbstone opinions spring from the heart, and represent the feelings of millions of Americans as they contemplate the world today. We would have little to worry about, however, if we could dispose of our problems so simply. Even if we could produce everything we needed within our territorial boundaries, we could not escape the forces that are causing conflict and disorder in other parts of the world.

The impact of science upon the modern world is drawing us closer and closer to Europe, Asia, Africa, Hawaii, Australia, with every passing hour. It is as if great cosmic forces were at work in the affairs of men, forces as precise and unrelenting as the laws of physics. There are some who are dimly aware of these forces, and are trying desperately to check them. But on the whole, humanity appears to be so dazed and shocked by what has happened to it, that it has turned in desperation to leaders who promise solutions.

This is Peril No. 1 that faces democracy all over the world. It permeates and combines practically every other peril here listed, and is the greatest challenge to self-government that we have faced in America since 1776.

But first let me define my terms. Here is a definition of democracy which I prepared in cooperation with several of our Town Hall speakers in New York. While I realize that no definition of democracy today can be entirely satisfactory to everyone, I think this one contains all of the essentials and one, in particular, which is customarily neglected:

"Democracy is a constitutional form of government with a system of checks and balances, parliamentary assembly, popular suffrage, periodic elections, and a bill of rights. It is based upon respect for the individual and, while adhering to the principle of majority rule as a fundamental tenet of democracy, the rights of minorities to full privileges of citizenship are not abridged under this form of government. It is the aim of democracy to give the fullest measure of freedom to the individual to develop his maximum capacities so long as this development does not interfere with the welfare and rights of others. *Democracy presupposes a system of universal education and the dissemination of unbiased news and information on a basis which will permit of an honestly informed public opinion.*"

Perils of Democracy

1. The growing complexity of modern life and the difficulty on the part of the individual citizen of understanding the involved economic, social and political problems facing all government today.
2. Unemployment.
3. Increasing public debt.
4. Slums and poor housing.
5. Conflicts between capital and labor.
6. Conflicts between government and business.
7. Lessening influence of religion.
8. Instability of modern home life.
9. The swing away from representative government, and the tendency of law makers to follow rather than lead public opinion.
10. Growth of special interest pressure groups.
11. Public apathy and "escapism."
12. International conflicts.
13. Inadequate educational system.

In contrast to this, we have compiled a definition of dictatorship:

"While modern dictatorships may preserve some of the outward forms of democracy, we understand a dictatorship to be government by a single ruler or a small group who in effect form 'the state' and who hold the interests of 'the state' to be at all times supreme over the interests of any individual or minority. Dictatorships are usually aggressively nationalistic and militaristic. *Education under a dictatorship is rigidly controlled by the state and no news or information may reach the populations of countries under this form of government without the approval of the state.*"

Now considering the two together, it is clear that all of the mechanics of parliamentary assembly, popular suffrage and so on come to naught if the state is allowed to control education, censor and color the news, and bombard the population with propaganda to keep the ruling party in power. Abraham Lincoln once told us that this nation could not survive half slave and half free. While we may come to this conclusion reluctantly, we cannot look at the world today and hope to live in peace with half of the nations under authoritarian rulers and half under democratic governments.

Let us not delude ourselves on this point. When millions of human beings are held in subjugation behind national boundaries, listening to voices of their dictators, hearing only the news the party in power wants them to hear, they are no longer free men. Whether they accept authoritarianism voluntarily or not, does not matter. When millions of people can be made to move as a unit at the will of a single man, and at his word plunge a continent into a war of frightfulness, such a nation or nations is a menace to a civilization based upon law and justice for the individual.

We have seen Europe turned into an armed camp by the spread of this disease which has followed the breakdown of democracy. Are we in America so different from our fellow men who live on the other side of the Atlantic? Granting similar economic, political and social conditions, would we have reacted so differently to the influences to which our European neighbors were subjected? Before answering these questions, let us look honestly at some of our own problems

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., 39-year old North Carolinian, is moderator of radio's most famous public forum, "America's Town Meeting of the Air." He is also President of Town Hall in New York, and conducts CURRENT HISTORY'S regular department, "What's YOUR Opinion?" Formerly an actor, manager, and lecture tour agent, Mr. Denny has been able to combine the best showmanship of Broadway with the deep zeal of the educational pioneer. His radio program brings in more than 60,000 letters each season. Mr. Denny conceived it to fill a conspicuous need—the need to "educate the independents—those voters who hold allegiance to no party—so that political parties will have to produce candidates that appeal to them." Moderator Denny loves music, dancing, loses his temper seldom; is the soul of neatness, a gull for hair tonics, speaks softly, smiles broadly, wears silver-rimmed glasses, is careful with other people's money, careless with his own, is married and has three children.

which at this point are far less acute than they were in Europe, for we are a country with great natural resources, a democratic tradition, and almost universal literacy.

Consider Peril No. 2—Unemployment. How long can we continue to support ten to twelve million unemployed at public expense? European nations have put their unemployed to work manufacturing arms and munitions and great fortresses. A new armament program will soon be placed before the Congress of the United States. Will this be our solution? If so, it will be another step along the path which Europe has followed.

The federal budget is not the only government budget in America which is out of balance. The total public debt of municipal, state and national governments reaches the astounding total of $60,036,000,000 or $454 for every inhabitant of the United States. We are following Europe's example closely in this respect.

Prime breeders of discontent under any political system are slums and poor housing. How can you talk to an unemployed, undernourished inhabitant of our slums about the advantages of liberty and democracy when democracy means this kind of life to him? It was in these areas abroad that Bolshevism, Fascism, and Nazism were born and flourished.

Volumes have been written about the conflicts between capital and labor, and government and business. It is impossible to deal with them adequately here, except to cite them as additional perils to the orderly processes of democracy. Until the leaders of capital and labor and government and business can learn to reason together about their common problems, the existing cleavages will stand as constant threats to the democratic way of life.

Lincoln Steffens in one of his books tells of walking down Fifth Avenue with the Devil, and coming upon a store window in which a merchant was advertising pure Truth for sale. "Ah, pure Truth; that is something that will put you out of business," said Steffens. "Yes," said the Devil, "it might if I didn't know what to do about it." "Ah, but what can you do about it?" said Steffens. "Pure Truth!" said his Satanic Majesty, "I would tempt man to organize it."

As to what has caused the lessening influence of religion on our life today, no one can pronounce the final word. In fact, there are those who claim that we are turning again to religion to find the solutions of all our problems. The subject is debatable for it deals with processes deep in the lives of men. But we do not have to look very far back in our own history to find the time when organized religion had a much stronger hold on the actions of men than it has today. And it seems apparent that much of this decline of influence has been due to denominational conflicts among the Protestant churches and the insistence of various religious groups that their way was *the* way of truth. Of course the church has had to face the competition of distracting attractions—the movies, the radio, the theatre. Whether or not it can develop ways of enlisting the loyalty of young people remains to be seen. We can take warning from what has happened to the young people in Russia, Germany, and Italy.

Good roads, the automobile, movies, the radio, the airplane, have all contributed to the instability of modern home life. Sociologists, criminologists and child study experts tell us that *the home is the most important single* influence in the life of any individual. Our school and college curriculums are full of weird courses, but to the best of my knowledge, there are only one university—the University of North Carolina—and two or three smaller colleges in the country endeavoring to prepare young men and women for the responsibilities of marriage and home life. The dictatorships place no importance on the home except as breeding places for the state. Although it is eighth on my list, I cannot think of any greater peril to democracy than the instability of modern home life, for individuals without character and integrity can never make self-government a reality—and building character and integrity is a prime function of the home.

Should our elected officials lead or follow public opinion? As we swing away from representative government, and as our elected officials pay more attention to "feeling the public pulse" than studying the facts and helping conscientiously to lead public opinion, we are making it easier for the demagogue to rise to power with promises of bread and circuses.

Closely associated with this peril is the latest menace to the welfare of

democratic institutions, the rapid growth of special interest pressure groups. Politicians must be vote getters, and to be reelected, must be vote holders. If a legislator is convinced that his job depends upon his voting for the desires of a certain pressure group, he is very likely to vote that way, no matter what his personal convictions may be.

Public apathy has been the root of evil in all forms of government since men began living together in communities. It was not until their pocketbooks or personal privileges were touched that they became interested in matters of government. It still appears to be a human failing to turn to government when we want something, and to turn against government whenever its activities interfere with our particular business or privilege.

Akin to public apathy is the growth of "escapism," which of course is a by-product of peril number one. When problems seem too difficult for us, we try to do something else—go to the movies, a prize fight, or organize a "Don't Worry Club."

Slowly the area of international conflict widens. Yesterday it was Germany and Poland, then England, then France. For seven years Japan has been at the throat of China in an undeclared war. And now the great Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics "defends" herself in an undeclared war on little Finland. The armies of Holland and Belgium are on guard. Italy spars with Russia for domination in the Balkans. Some prophets of doom predict a sixty year war in Europe. Will the United States become involved? What then would become of democracy?

The widely quoted statement by H. G. Wells that we are witnessing a race between education and chaos was never more evident than it is today. We need not go into an analysis of why education is so far behind in this race. We are faced with a condition and not a theory. Here comes Chaos out in front, and there is Education way behind. Those of us who have placed our money on Education and a system of law and order depending upon Education winning this race had better give some thought to helping this fellow, if we expect our tickets to pay.

Why do people shy away from education when we all know that it is the very foundation of democratic gov-

(Continued on page 54)

MAJOR R. ERNEST DUPUY

VIII. Our New Arms Program

▶▶ Our greatest preparedness drive is under way with equal emphasis on men and materials

For the first time in our national history the Regular Army, in peace time, is being organized for mass training in a number of complete divisional units—on a very small scale as compared with European peacetime organization, it is true, but nevertheless mass training. There is talk of "stream-lined" divisions, of automatic and semi-automatic weapons, of industrial mobilization to supply the national armed forces.

Just what, with Europe and Asia already aflame, does this mean?

Is the United States about to embark upon some quixotic overseas venture, as some of our citizens fear; or, on the other hand, is this augmentation of national defense but a logical move to bring into actuality the hemisphere defense to which the nation, by reason of its Monroe Doctrine commitments and the dictates of self-preservation, must adhere?

To the soldier the answer is simple. For the civilian, unacquainted with the technique of national defense, alarmed by the mounting costs of armaments, the clouds of uncertainty multiply. Some orientation is necessary.

Briefly, the United States is arming to ensure that, insofar as is humanly possible to prevent it, the fire and sword of foreign aggression may not fall upon our homeland.

Primary consideration in any military situation is the terrain. The United States is bounded north and south by neighbors—sovereign states; east and west lie the Atlantic and Pacific. Aggression must then come initially by water or by air over the water. This is true whether that aggression be initiated directly against the continental United States, or indirectly, by infiltration of one sort or another, into the domain of our neighbors to obtain a springboard for attack against us.

The first line of American defense, therefore, is the United States Navy, today admittedly the most powerful existing fleet. But a navy is dependent upon its bases. That is, warships cannot operate *en masse* beyond a certain radius from a point where they may be supplied, overhauled and repaired. That effective fleet radius of action is approximately 3,500 miles. The United States Navy must further be prepared to attack the national defense problem in either Atlantic or Pacific. For that purpose the Panama Canal is the keystone of American sea power.

With this picture in mind one can realize what General Malin Craig, retired Chief of Staff of the Army, meant in his annual report, published June 30 last, in which he stated in effect that the Army objective for national defense was a future economical, balanced position as follows:—

a. An outpost line for security and the protection of initial defense forces; the elements manning it, both ground and air, prepared for immediate action. The Panama Canal Zone and Hawaii, properly strengthened, and the proposed installations in Puerto Rico and Alaska, to constitute this general line.

b. The main position. Elements manning it consist of the initial protective force—composed of the Regular Army (less the forces on outpost duty), all the Federalized National Guard and certain Reserves assigned in emergency.

Today the continental United States cannot be reached directly by hostile military air attack launched from foreign mainlands. It can be reached, however, by attack launched from advanced bases and from plane-carriers. Today bombing planes have an effective radius of little more than 500 miles. That is, they may be expected to be able to take off with full load of bombs and sufficient gas to execute a mission up to 500 miles distance, and return.

We have, then, two concrete yardsticks for national defense, the first the 3,500 mile radius of fleet action, the second a 1,000 mile air radius.

The most pressing element of national defense is the establishment and protection of bases, air and naval, to ensure the U. S. Battle Fleet mobility to function in either Atlantic or Pacific to the effective limit of fleet action, and to ensure that the Army's G.H.Q. Air Force may utilize its fluidity for concentration and movement from advance bases to the limit of its own radius of action.

Bases are springboards for the offensive action which would meet any invader. They are highly organized widespread areas, and must be garrisoned and protected—not by the elements which use them as springboards, but by additional forces, both land and air, to prevent sudden seizure.

Here is where the Regular Army comes into the picture. Seasoned, regular troops must make up these garrisons, consisting of anti-aircraft artillery and its elaborate warning net, fast-moving infantry, field artillery, coast artillery and other auxiliary services. Only by these means can bases be protected from sudden thrust. Such garrisons must exist; they cannot be improvised after danger threatens.

Back of the outpost line of advance bases, both on our own shores and in overseas possessions, must stand the main force, capable of combat teamwork, capable of prompt concentration by motor road and railroad anywhere in the continental United States. Should emergency arise, this main force of Regulars, National Guard and Reserves must carry on until a National Army can be raised —a matter of a year or more.

When President Roosevelt early in September last proclaimed the neutrality of the United States, the Regular Army consisted of approximately 165,000 enlisted men and 14,000 officers. This force was scattered in posts throughout the continental United States and our possessions—the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama Canal Zone, Alaska and Puerto Rico. Deducting the necessary "housekeeping" forces—officers and men on duty in schools, handling supply and in the technical services—there remained for actual mobile combat troop duty in the United States exclusive of Air Corps and fixed coast defenses, 70,000 officers and men.

On September 8 an Executive order authorized an increase in the Regular Army enlisted strength to bring its global total to 227,000 still some 53,000 short of the 280,000 peace time strength promulgated—but never appropriated for—by the National Defense Act of 1920. The same order authorized an increase in the National Guard from 190,000 to 235,000, a number that falls far short of the Defense Act National Guard minimum of 424,000.

Within a month a brigade of infantry and an additional quota of coast artillery had been sent to the Panama Canal Zone, to augment the garrison. The Puerto Rican Department, already authorized as an advance base to protect the Caribbean and guarantee the eastern defense of the Panama Canal, received units of field artillery, coast artillery, engineer and air detachment and auxiliary services, to reinforce the small Regular and National Guard infantry elements already there.

This of necessity robbed the main position—the continental United States—of several thousand Regular troops. Within this same period of time there was a reorganization of the mobile Regular troops into five divisions of infantry, complete in all elements although at peace strength, to form an army corps; and the organization of some of the additional units essential to make that corps function as an entity.

Furthermore these divisional units have been massed at Fort Benning, Georgia; Fort Sam Houston, Texas; Fort Lewis, Washington; Camp McClellan, Alabama, and Camp Jackson, South Carolina. The few corps units possible of creation under the new authorization are being trained at Fort Bragg, North Carolina; Fort Knox, Kentucky, and Camp Ord, California. The cavalry concentration goes to Fort Bliss, Texas. All these posts are in areas where all-year-round training is practicable, and the plan calls for further concentration of the entire corps for mass maneuvers in the coming spring.

MAJOR R. ERNEST DUPUY is a military expert who does not like to be called one, preferring to be known as "a soldier who also writes." He is author of *Perish by the Sword*, and *World in Arms* (both published recently), and co-author with Major George Fielding Eliot of *If War Comes*, which was selected as one of the ten outstanding non-fiction books of 1937 by CURRENT HISTORY'S Literary Advisory Board. Before the World War he was a newspaper reporter on the old *New York Herald*, then run by the late James Gordon Bennett. As a soldier, he is a graduate of the Field Artillery School and the Command and General Staff School. In the World War he served overseas with the 57th Artillery. He is now on duty at the United States Military Academy at West Point. Major Dupuy is a native New Yorker, is fifty-two years old, is married, has a son who is a recent West Point graduate.

Chief of Staff George C. Marshall

Ever since 1935 General Staff experiments have been going on with the Second Division, at Fort Sam Houston, to meet the requirements of all combat teams—mobility and striking power. The old type World War division, with its four regiments of infantry in two brigades, its artillery brigade of three regiments, and all the additional technical and supply services, had proved too unwieldy for modern use. The peace strength of the old type division was approximately 13,500, its war strength something like 24,000.

Experimentation crystallized in a smaller force to be organized in a triangular formation—three regiments of infantry, together with a two-regiment artillery support, and a peace-time strength of 436 officers and 8,517 enlisted men.

The new type division is partly motorized—that is, all its transportation is automotive. For short hauls, with its supply vehicles empty, all personnel can be transported. With supply vehicles loaded, the doughboys must do some walking, alleviated by "shuttling," which is to say that certain elements can be carried by motor to the end of the day's march, the vehicles then returning and picking up other elements in turn. By this means the new division can march, day in and day out, at the rate of forty miles a day instead of twelve or fifteen.

By the equipment of the riflemen with the new Garand semi-automatic rifle and additional machine guns—

(Continued on page 60)

RUPERT HUGHES

IX. Thomas E. Dewey of New York

◀◀ Capable, energetic, this young crime-buster is ready for a career of high statesmanship

SOME months ago a dark-haired, serious-looking young man stepped up to receive an honorary degree from Dartmouth College. He was Thomas Edmund Dewey, District Attorney for New York City, "lawyer for several millions of people." The citation accompanying the degree described him as one who "sprang from a small-town environment to project himself to dramatic pre-eminence in the world's largest metropolis."

Today the name of Thomas Dewey has been dramatically projected over the entire nation. Groups have sprung up from Coast to Coast supporting him for the Republican nomination for President. Polls of public opinion find him high in favor as a presidential candidate. His campaign was officially launched a few weeks ago and many political observers believe the Dewey bandwagon has begun to roll. His recent tour through the West brought out enthusiastic crowds.

What manner of man is Thomas Dewey? What is his background? What are his abilities? What are his ideas about government and social philosophy? These are the questions Rupert Hughes discusses in the following article.—The Editors.

There were only eight thousand people in Owosso, Michigan, when Thomas Edmund Dewey was born there on March 24, 1902. In his own words, he lived "on the best street in town, but we never had much money. My father had an extraordinary intellect and was a fine newspaper editor. My mother was, and is, a good business woman."

As a boy, he wanted to sell newspapers, but his mother demurred until he was eleven, then compromised by letting him sell weeklies and monthlies. Two years later, at thirteen, he had nine or ten boys working as his agents. When he was sixteen, he worked in a drug-store.

By the time he was ready to enter the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, he had saved up eight hundred dollars and insisted on paying his own expenses through the first year. In addition to his courses of study he worked on *The Michigan Daily News* as a reporter, later as a telegraph editor. He played chess and bridge, sang in the glee club, and was a leading member in the musical fraternity, Pi Mu Alpha. He studied voice with William Wheeler, head of the music department. He was also a soloist in the Ann Arbor Methodist Church at $7.50 a Sunday. He kept well up in his classes, led the glee club, and acted in college plays.

There was nothing in all this activity to indicate the slightest interest in the law. Dewey continued to study voice, played the leading role in the annual college opera. He won first prize in the Michigan State Singing Contest, qualifying him for the national finals, in which he won third prize.

Following his graduation, he was awarded a scholarship at the Chicago Musical College. While he was in Chicago, his mother's cousin, Leonard Reid, gave him a job reading law and doing legal chores in the office of Litsinger, Healy and Reid.

Percy Rector Stephens, of the Chicago College of Music, advised the young baritone to accompany him to New York where he might continue his singing career. Dewey had dallied with the thought of studying law at Harvard but that university did not accept Michigan credits. Columbia would. He figured it out: he would combine his vocal lessons with legal studies in New York.

New York offered him another inducement. Stephens' secretary, Miss Frances Eileen Hutt, beautiful, gifted young mezzo-soprano, would be going to New York, too. When Thomas Dewey fell in love with Frances Eileen Hutt, it meant that a son of a northernmost state and grandson of one of the founders of the Republican Party, had chosen for

his mate a daughter of the Confederacy.

Frances Hutt has all the traditional graciousness, beauty and charm of a Southern woman. Her heart is a hearth of warm devotion to her husband and her two sons. Yet she exacts all the joy there is in life, takes it with bravery, spices it with quick wit, and has, as Dewey says, "plenty of horse sense."

When Thomas Dewey first set foot on New York City soil—or rather, on its pavement—gangsterism was just burgeoning out into the lush tropical growth it reached under the influence of prohibition. Crime was organizing, becoming big business. A piratical navy laced the seas. Piratical fleets of trucks zoomed the highways. Machine-gun bullets sprayed the streets.

The young Michigan minstrel must have regarded the situation with repugnance, but he never dreamed that he was born to set it right. He practiced his solfeggios and studied his arias at the studio; attended classes at the Law School and made notes of the lectures. He also edited the national quarterly of his fraternity, Pi Mu Alpha, and served as its national historian.

Dewey's mother says that his inclination toward a vocal career was shaken by having to sing at an important concert when he had a painfully sore throat. He realized at that time that his whole life would be at the mercy of two vocal chords. And the more he studied law, the more it drew him toward the great opportunities it offered, the more it woke in him admiration and ambition.

After receiving his law degree at Columbia, he met another young lawyer, Sewell T. Tyng, who was to be his close associate in his later career. As a Republican district captain, Tyng was impressed by Dewey's enthusiasm and made him an assistant, set him to ringing doorbells, canvassing for votes, watching the count on election days. With this as a start, he rose rapidly from the ranks of the Young Republican Club and became an officer and chairman of increasingly important committees.

By 1928, though only twenty-six, he was handling most of the litigation in the law firm of MacNamara and Seymour.

In December, 1930, one of his firm's clients was sued by "a lady who changed the course of my life." It fell to Dewey to prepare the case for trial. He decided to call in outside

Two years old.

counsel, recommending George Z. Medalie, former Assistant Attorney General of New York State. Medalie was profoundly impressed by young Dewey's thorough knowledge of the case and together they prepared for trial.

About the time of the completion of the trial, Medalie accepted the vastly important post of United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York. Medalie later offered him the post of Chief Assistant United States Attorney. It was unprecedented. No one so young had ever held the post before. Dewey accepted and at twenty-eight became the administrative head of the largest prosecuting office in the Federal Government, with sixty lawyers under him. For nearly three years he toiled in that office and acquired a knowledge of every phase of the Federal Government.

As Chief Assistant United States Attorney, Dewey developed a technique that he made famous later and used for many notable victories. While he gave the most elaborate protection and secrecy to the victims who lent the law their aid, he caused unwilling witnesses to fear him more than they feared the criminals. He taught the recalcitrant that he could and would put even the wealthiest into jail.

On November 22, 1933, Medalie decided he had all of the public life that he could afford and suggested that, pending the appointment of a successor, Dewey be named to the post. Thus, at thirty-one, Dewey became the youngest man ever designated as United States Attorney in the Southern District of New York. One newspaper headline called it "A Triumph for Baby Prosecutor."

By this time Dewey was coming into public recognition. His record as a prosecutor began to receive national attention. But after only five weeks as United States Attorney, Dewey lost his job. President Roosevelt finally decided upon his choice for a successor to George Z. Medalie, and Thomas Dewey returned to private practice.

Meanwhile, all unknown to him and to them, a body of high-minded New York citizens were preparing a new public career for him of a far more dramatic nature. As it transpired later, the city was being bled by the policy game of a sum estimated as high as twenty million dollars a year. The District Attorney of New York County at that time was William C. Dodge. But the grand jury which was supposed to aid him in repressing crime suddenly revolted against what they called his "cold-water tactics" and would not tolerate Dodge or the substitutes he suggested. It demanded a new and special prosecutor who would make a real assault on the evils it espied. The jury suggested six names, with Thomas Dewey at the head of the list. Dodge disapproved of the entire six. The situation became so tense that prominent New Yorkers telegraphed the Governor, Herbert H. Lehman, protesting against Dodge's activities in defending his inactivities.

Finally, Governor Lehman intervened, submitting the names of four lawyers to Dodge with a request, amounting to a warning, to appoint one of them as a special prosecutor. To remove all suspicion of partisanship, the Governor named only eminent Republicans: Charles E. Hughes, Jr., George Z. Medalie, Thomas D. Thatcher, and Charles H. Tuttle. They all declined but united in a recommendation that Dewey be appointed.

With scant enthusiasm, Governor Lehman yielded, protesting: "I'll appoint Dewey since you all insist, but I still say he is too unknown."

"Within a few weeks after you

appoint him," said Medalie, "he'll be one of the best-known men in the country."

Dewey announced his acceptance and one of the papers headlined: "The Young David Is Sent in Against the Gang Goliath." He was still "Young Mr. Dewey" to the newspapers; he will probably remain "Young Mr. Dewey" as long as he lives.

The criminals laughed. They called Dewey the "Boy Scout."

As Special Prosecutor, Dewey jumped into the thick of New York's rackets. Before long the loan sharks and extortionists in the flour, bakery, and restaurant industries were crushed out. Dewey smashed the vice and narcotic rings which had flourished for years. Nor did he spare the higher-ups. The kingpins of the rackets fell before his efficient, vigorous prosecution.—Ed.

Once Dewey showed the way, his example and his methods spread, and successful wars on crime flared up all over the nation.

The least known and yet the most remarkable part of his achievements was the long, slow, quiet perfection of organization. He was the organizer of victory before he struck. He recruited, equipped, and officered his legal army, then trained it, rehearsed it and himself long before he ventured forth to battle.

When he came out he came with a swoop, brushed aside the scouts and the pickets, flankers and patrols, advance parties, main bodies and reserves surrounding the citadels. He smashed on to headquarters before resistance could be consolidated.

His early days in his new office were perilous and anxious ones. People were shouting at him to do something. Only in the dark circles of crime was it suspected how busy he and his little army were. He has always been careless of danger, too intent on his work to take peril into consideration. His staff has learned that the mobs offered a reward of $25,000 to anybody who would murder Dewey.

It is worth noting that in the very first of his campaigns Dewey came to the rescue of the people who needed him most desperately, the wretched victims of pitiless usurers. In a swift, surprise move, thirty-six loan sharks were arrested. They were held on 252 counts on 126 indictments. Day after day Dewey's staff won convictions until he had made a clean sweep.

This was the first time in the history of American criminal prosecution that a widespread organized mob was attacked on so broad a scale.

Less than two years after Dewey took his special office, Mayor La Guardia publicly requested the young prosecutor to run in the elections for District Attorney on the Republican-Fusion ticket. It carried the elections. Dewey ran far ahead of La Guardia and was generally credited with the major share of the victory. His plurality was nearly twenty per cent more than La Guardia's. In his first campaign for elective office he had demonstrated new gifts that were to lead him on to new worlds of hope and hardship.

His election electrified the whole country, for Tammany had been a national word for corrupt political power entrenched and immemorially immovable since there had been a nation. Dewey had broken Tammany's supposed strangle-hold on the District Attorney's office. He had dealt Tammany a staggering blow.

Thomas Dewey took firm hold of the difficult task of organizing the nation's largest municipal prosecuting office. There followed a long series of important actions against key

A vacation group at Glen Lake, Michigan, in 1912. Because his expression and the contours of his face have changed so little, Dewey is easily identified. His father stands directly behind. His mother is on the extreme left.

figures. Highly important was the trial of James J. Hines.—Ed.

At the end of five months Dewey had begun to attack the higher-ups in city politics. He moved against James J. Hines, nationally-known Tammany leader who had been a kingpin in New York's politics for more than fifteen years, accusing him of influencing and intimidating judges and law-enforcement officers so that racketeers could operate unmolested.

Hines was brought to trial. But just as the trial approached its close after a stormy six weeks, it was cut short by Justice Ferdinand Pecora in a "mistrial" decision.

Despite the setback, the demand for Dewey as the Republican candidate for governor continued to simmer. Governor Lehman had already announced he would run for the United States Senate and the Democrats groped frantically for a candidate to check Dewey. As a matter of political history, Dewey was positively informed that Lehman would retire to private life rather than run again for the governorship.

When the Republican State Convention opened September 28, Thomas E. Dewey was nominated by acclamation. Dewey decided to accept. Once he was in it, he gave his heart to the task before him. He was a Republican from infancy and had always been active in Republican political organizations.

RUPERT HUGHES, author, editor, composer, soldier, playwright, motion picture director, celebrates his sixty-eighth birthday at the end of this month. He was born in a small Missouri town, was graduated from Western Reserve University, then known as Adelbert College, and received his master's degree at Yale. He became a captain in the Mexican border service, served in the World War as a captain of the infantry, later being promoted to major, and, ten years after the war, was appointed lieutenant colonel. His first books were about music and musicians, the best known among which were *American Composers* and the *Music Lover's Cyclopedia*. In all, Rupert Hughes has written close to forty books, not including eight plays which were produced and which went on tour.

The next day, the Democratic Convention waited in gloomy confusion until Postmaster General James A. Farley strode in smiling and announced: "The Governor will run again!"

Uproar followed. President Roosevelt sent a telegram and gave his support to the entire ticket. He praised Lehman for his "personal sacrifice." That was the word for it, since everybody knew that Lehman had most reluctantly resigned his dreams of the Senate.

It is one of the inescapable qualities of an election that both sides cannot win, both cannot lose. Yet in this election both Dewey and Lehman came near to doing both. Lehman won, but by so small a plurality that he gained little glory. Dewey lost, but his defeat captured the enthusiasm of the nation. He lost by only 64,000 votes, running approximately 669,000 votes ahead of what party registration would have indicated. His personal popularity and vote-getting ability must have attracted the votes of a tremendous number of Democrats. Dewey polled the biggest vote ever gained in New York State by a Republican candidate for Governor in a non-presidential year. It was bigger than any Republican candidate for President had ever received in the state.

Soon thereafter, the successful prosecution of Hines by Dewey thrust the latter into the national limelight more strongly than ever. Despite his remarkable showing as a candidate for Governor, Dewey had seemed completely convinced that his defeat had ended his chances for high office. He was thunderstruck, therefore, to find himself boomed everywhere for the Presidency. *Fortune* magazine confronted him with one of the earliest of the straw-vote polls. Like Abu ben Adhem's, Dewey's name led all the rest. A later Gallup poll gave him 33 per cent for first choice, his nearest rival 18 per cent.

ABOUT the same time the Associated Press announced that its editorial experts had chosen, "as the most significant news developments of the year 1938," a chain of events in many of which Dewey was a central figure: "The trial of Tammany top-flight Hines on charges of selling political protection to the underworld; the bitterly fought gubernatorial campaign from which Governor Lehman emerged a fourth-time winner; the sentencing of society stockbroker Richard Whitney; the arrest of J. Richard (Dixie) Davis, heir to the Dutch Schultz policy racket."

All across the nation, in communities where there was political corruption—which meant almost every community in the nation—the watchword was, "Give us a Dewey of our own."

Meanwhile, Dewey continued to set the national pace for vigorous, intelligent prosecution. The Hines convic-

At eighteen Dewey worked on a neighbor's farm.

tion was followed by two other notable cases, in both of which Dewey scored dramatic victories. The first case involved Martin T. Manton, senior judge of the United States Court of Appeals, accused of accepting bribes for decisions in cases covering vast sums. The second involved Fritz Kuhn, leader of the German-American bund on a charge of forgery and theft from his own organization.

The number of underworld personages Dewey has convicted and imprisoned or driven into exile is unparalleled. He has an unapproached record in the number of organized rackets he has destroyed, many of them combinations of both employers and employees under the humiliating and ruinous tyranny of thugs.

The extortions and plunder from which he has saved his city and its people are enormous. Far more precious is his rescue of businessmen and laborers from their craven submission to outlaws working in collusion with sworn enforcers of the law.

And to the small and big criminals Dewey has destroyed should be added many of those destroyed in other states as a result of his success and his methods.

He has, therefore, been recognized almost from the first as not merely a local figure, but one of national interest and influence. As has been noted, his loss of the governorship strangely enhanced his standing as a candidate for the Presidency. In the meanwhile he has exerted in his own state much more than the power of a local District Attorney, for, though he was personally defeated, his party swept along in the tide of his enormous vote, capturing both houses of the State Legislature.

Dewey at work is the modern executive personified. His main desk lacks even a telephone, since he hates to be interrupted by the bell during his almost incessant conferences. When he must talk on the wire, he goes into another room.

He makes himself many men, a hundred-armed Briareus, by delegating his power as far as possible. Having selected his aides with all care, he gives them full leeway and expects from them wisdom, experience, and a sense of responsibility. Yet he is always available for conference. When any of his staff bring him a finished report, he is likely, as one of them says, to tear it to pieces. But he ex-

(Continued on page 62)

SHELBY CULLOM DAVIS

X. Business Faces the Forties

▶▶ Moving into a new decade, America can look forward to new horizons and renewed progress

"NEVER sell America short," J. Pierpont Morgan is said to have cautioned, and a tip from this eminent financier was usually worth following. Yet we have passed through a decade in which this axiom, for the first time in American history, would have been misleading.

Glancing backward toward the departing Thirties, it is plain that these years represent the Lost Decade. In no other in our history have our production and standard of living failed to rise above previous peaks. For a time, in 1937, it looked as if we might push through and claim our expected heritage. Then the bottom fell out and business declined more precipitously than during the 1929–32 panic.

Just how badly did we fail during the Thirties? Quite badly. Not only did we fail to progress in a material sense, but we actually slipped back. We had on an average during the Thirties fifteen million more inhabitants and yet our aggregate production declined. There was less to divide among more. For each person, therefore, we produced about one-fifth less than in what the statisticians call the normal years 1923–25.

This does not mean we all had one-fifth fewer suits, shirts, socks, shoes, hairpins, neckties, handkerchiefs, pajamas, pillow cases and dresses. Production is measured in other than the articles we wear or consume. It is measured in the homes we build, the hospitals we erect, the new factories and the new machinery which produce wealth. It is chiefly these durable articles that we failed to produce adequately during the Thirties.

Such retrogression has never before occurred in American history! Usually we look back with satisfaction at the completion of a decade. We worked hard and got our just due—and the record showed it. Let us look at that record. Industrial production during the Twenties increased one-third over that of the Teens, although the latter period was abnormal with wartime excesses. And the Teens averaged two-thirds over the first decade of this century. During the first decade production more than doubled over the previous decade, and in the Nineties increased nearly two-thirds over the Eighties and so on all the way back to when we first became important as an industrial nation.

No wonder our leadership is puzzled and bewildered at what has recently happened to us. It is a tremendous and significant fact.

Fortunately, the Forties bid fair to mark the dawn of a more pleasant era; 1940 in particular should be a good business year. Those Sleeping Giants of our economy, the great durable goods industries such as the railroads, public utilities and construction, are bestirring themselves after almost a decade of lethargy. For several months, the great Pittsburgh district, home of our heavy industries, has been aglow with blast furnaces and steel mills operating at near capacity. Business indices which measure the temperature of our national well-being are flirting with a new high, although they will probably contract somewhat during the first quarter of 1940. There is every rea-

FOLLOWING GRADUATION from Princeton University in 1930, Shelby Cullom Davis became European representative of the Columbia Broadcasting System. He remained at his European post for five years; when he returned he entered investment banking, becoming vice-president of the Delaware Fund. He is the author of *Wells of Manpower*, in which he contends that the basic aim of imperialism in Africa was the acquisition of ample manpower for war. Another book by Mr. Davis is in process of publication. Its title is similar to the theme of CURRENT HISTORY'S anniversary issue; it is called *Looking to the Forties.*

son now to suppose that 1940 will be the best business year since 1929.

At the moment the heavy impact of a European War seems to outweigh every other consideration. It is bound to influence the American economy, although we should not over-emphasize what is happening abroad to the neglect of the urgent needs of our own household. We live in a veritable Eldorado of riches compared with the rest of the world, and our task in 1940 is to harness our national energies to these natural riches.

During the past seven years, some of the diagnoses of business ills made by members of the Administration have hurt American business deeply—particularly the belief that private business can no longer nourish the country and that large-scale public investment is therefore necessary. Business, according to this theory, is a "has-been."

Wouldn't that be enough to make a Scrooge of the most light hearted gladhander? After radiating sunshine during the reign of profits of the Twenties, business did turn sour for a good part of the Thirties, but that is all over now. Industry has buckled on shining armor preparatory to the fray with government as to which can supply the higher standard of living.

Government says that half of our market lies in the group where families earn less than $1,250 a year. There are approximately five and one-half million of such families.

What would happen, Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics and a government spokesman, has asked, if every family's income in this $1,250 group were increased by the small amount of $2.25 a day? Answering his own question, he listed the fabulous increases in purchases that would be made in perishable, durable and non-durable goods.

This small increase per day in income would mean an increase in oranges purchased from 75 cents per year per family to $2.89. Cosmetic purchases would rise from $1.57 to $4.16 per family. The expenditures on movies would triple. About $800 millions more would be spent for food, $416 millions more for clothing, $615 millions more for housing, $218 millions more for fuel, light and refrigeration, $385 millions more for transportation.

Going a step further, Lubin says that a moderate increase for all families whose income is less than $2,500 would practically wipe out present surpluses.

The Administration would bring about this increase in family income by priming the pump with still more purchasing power. In addition, appropriate legislation would see to it that less of the national income goes to what roughly comprises the capital and management group and more goes to those who labor with their hands.

In answer business says: "Through research to new horizons." That is business' reply to the statement that our geographical frontier has been reached, that the purchasing power of the lower one-third of our population must be raised. Purchasing power will be raised, says business, "through research to new horizons." New products create new jobs and new purchasing power. Research makes products cheaper—and that raises the standard of living of everyone.

Charles F. Kettering, vice-president and inventive genius of General Motors, has observed that the growth of new industries follows well-defined patterns. First of all, there is the research stage. Then there is the "shirt-losing" stage. And finally the stage when the industry "explodes" into a large volume of activity and employment.

The research stage is ably managed by the great corporations, but there has been a lag in the shirt-losing stage during the Thirties. And although shirt-losing is unpleasant to the losers, it does provide temporary employment and at least helps to hasten the wide commercialization of a new article.

The disinclination to engage in "shirt-losing" during the Thirties was understandable. The shirts that were not already lost were at least in sad need of repair. Furthermore, great corporations shun shirt-losing practices. Think how much might have been lost on television had it been pushed hard before it was really ready for commercialization. As it is, television, and many other new products, are now in a position to contribute importantly to employment and business activity. Because of their cautious development during the Thirties, their importance has probably been underestimated.

During the Forties their full influence should be felt.

Not only should the new products of industry help stimulate activity, but the prosaic fact that old products wear out should help considerably. Although there is a tremendous obsolescence in all of industry, this is particularly true of the railroads. Machine tools and machinery of all sorts are generally acknowledged to be awaiting replacements when industry has a clearer vision of the future. Such phenomenal progress in efficiency has been made that the capital cost of many of these new tools can be paid for after a few years. The same holds true of the new streamlined trains that have been installed on certain runs. Under these conditions replacements begin to occur on a large scale.

Thus far labor's high wage scale has been a deterrent to replacements which have to compete with existing installations of machinery, houses, office buildings and equipment of all sorts. They compete on quality, of course, but price is always a factor, particularly in borderline cases. The higher the price of new machinery or houses, the more difficult to compete with the old. Business leaders have wisely kept prices in check during the recent rise in industrial production. The barometric price of steel, for instance, has been reaffirmed for the first quarter of 1940. One of the greatest problems next year will be for labor to control its desire for

wage increases and to be satisfied with steadier work at the same wage rate.

The 1940 legislative mill gives promise of proving less troublesome to business than in recent years and this is a factor of strength. Now that we have greater perspective, cannot much of our legislation in the Thirties be accounted for by the drastic economic conditions then prevailing, coupled with the fact that structural changes—in a sense a change of life—were taking place in the American economy?

The New Deal has introduced many inflexibilities into our economy, and because these represent great changes over old ways of doing things, there is an inclination to regard them all as bad. They are bad if the world of Adam Smith is the criterion. They have certainly altered the old capitalism we used to know.

Let us pass quickly over the changes. We have a managed agriculture, a compulsory old age insurance system, various relief systems, including unemployment compensation, a public investment agency, minimum wage and hours, collective bargaining and the greatest number of union members in our history, a managed currency and insurance on bank deposits.

Although this list is by no means all-inclusive, it points to a revolution in our economic system.

Uncle Sam's balance sheet for the 1937 and 1938 fiscal years.

CERTAINLY a great deal of the flexibility has been removed, but at the same time a great deal of the stress and strain has been eliminated. Deflating is now much more difficult than formerly. The unions, plus the minimum wage and hours act, are apt to prevent a deflation in wages; the A.A.A. is designed to prevent a deflation in commodity prices; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is to prevent runs on banks and hence a financial deflation.

If these various agencies had been in existence would the debacle of the early Thirties have occurred? Certainly it would not have been as severe. There would have been industrial stagnation, but no collapse.

Some economists believe that a collapse every so often is necessary because it purges the economy of an unwieldy debt structure. Like a gale of wind blowing onto a poker table, it scatters the chips just as they have all been collected by one player. The game begins all over again. Then after a period in which people say "No more debts for me," they begin to regain confidence and go into debt again.

Already two very wrong solutions to our difficulties have made some headway. They are: limiting the domestic market by various restrictions on interstate commerce, and limiting progress in production by taxing new machinery.

Basically we are a wealthy country, rich in natural resources. We cannot therefore take all the credit for our high standard of living as compared with other countries. But we can take credit for our tremendous domestic market of 130 million persons unimpeded by state tariff barriers. We fought a war for the Union and it is sacredly cemented with the blood of our ancestors. Union is an important cause of our greatness. The development of great mass production industries would have been impossible were America "Balkanized" and cut up into many different countries.

According to the Constitution no tariff can be laid on commerce among the separate states without the consent of Congress. Yet recent state legislation includes many measures that directly or indirectly restrict interstate commerce, such as checking the importation of citrus fruits from "foreign" states for alleged health reasons. This threat to free interstate commerce was recognized by Secretary of Commerce Hopkins as so serious that in November he appointed a special committee to wage war on it.

During the Thirties the threat of the machine has been widely discussed. Since 1930 about twenty million Americans have reached employment age without experiencing what might be called prosperous or normal times. Such an authority as *The Iron Age* believes this "lost generation" may be a threat to the machine. The movement is still young but there are indications that people believe machines are harmful and hence would hamper their installation.

Senator Bennett Champ Clark, known as a conservative Democrat, recently introduced a resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate the desirability of a tax on labor saving machinery. Bills have been introduced in a number of states to penalize the introduction of new machinery.

These twin threats to our economy—limiting the domestic market and hampering the machine—will probably pass in a period of good times. They are products of depression, when panaceas flourish. Even now, steps are being taken to reduce barriers to interstate trade. The Council of State Governments, a sort of league of nations of the states, is working hard toward that end.

One of the "inner circle" of New Deal economists recently questioned the importance placed upon business confidence. Said he, in effect: "Business confidence is a much abused term. Business men are only confident of the future when they see profits in their income accounts. These prof-

its are made possible by our pump priming activities." To clinch the argument, he pointed out that business spent more on plant and equipment in 1937, the year of the undistributed profits tax and Supreme Court fight, than in any year since 1930.

Naturally business spends more money when operations are close to capacity than when times are slack. Much of the money spent in 1937 went for expansion in the fast-growing kraft paper and chemical industries and for the introduction of the continuous rolling mill process in the steel industry. Several other industries went in for decentralization, notably the automobile and tire and rubber industries. Some general replacement of old by new equipment business appeared, but not on a large scale. This was because business executives felt cautious about the future and wondered whether they would be able to absorb the various reforms of the New Deal.

Since then many months have elapsed. Meanwhile old equipment has been wearing out and new processes have been developed. The business man has been absorbing various elements of New Deal reforms into his way of doing business. He has succeeded in cutting costs here and there and becoming more efficient in manufacture. Labor disputes, as shown by the record of the National Labor Relations Board in 1939, have been sharply reduced. And Congress at last, through remedial tax studies and legislation, seems disposed to give business an opportunity to see what it can do to put the unemployed to work. Even if war had not come to Europe, prospects were bright for a normal recovery in 1940, with a great deal of the pent-up demand for goods ready to be released.

War does not change these prospects. It only hastens them. Deficit dynamics, or government spending, is to be replaced by foreign spending on a scale relative to the intensity of the fighting abroad. This stimulus to business is as artificial as much of the pump priming was and it will last only as long as the war lasts. While it goes on, there is the ever present danger of the flash-point of inflation being touched off. The fever of speculation racked the stock exchange in September just after the outbreak of war and turned what many financial observers had ex-

(Continued on page 59)

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON

XI. The War and the Arts

▶▶ Once the artist was untouched by war but today all art bears the imprint of conflict

IN the wars of antiquity and the Middle Ages, when bands of professional hirelings spent the summer months in a polite game of hide-and-seek, a "war" might last half a century or longer and yet at no time interfere with the painter or the composer or the poet. But modern warfare, by the sheer brutality of its uninhibited violence, puts a complete stop to every form of artistic expression and turns the artist either into a soldier, actually engaged in the business of destroying his fellow-men, or into a civilian, shivering miserably in some underground hole called a shelter, while the merry sport of bomb-pitching goes on overhead.

Some years ago I came to the conclusion that, unless we succeeded in bridling modern man's recourse to terror as a form of applied politics, there would soon come a time when the arts would have no place in any of our "civilized countries," because those countries themselves shall have ceased to exist.

For the artist is only human. His body can experience a great deal of suffering without in any way affecting that spiritual reaction to the realities of the day which finds its expression in his particular form of art. But destroy his soul, make him feel that nothing he does has any intrinsic value, and he will cease to function or he will take his revenge upon his fellow-men by indulging in one of those grotesque and bizarre crazes which have made a visit to a modern art gallery almost as much of a torture as a morning spent in an asylum.

Illustrations from *The Arts*, by Hendrik Willem van Loon

Ever since the days of Johann Winckelmann, the German professor who founded the modern school of archeology, we have patiently accepted the fact that Greek sculpture was the beginning and end of all art, and that the chapter of artistic perfection was definitely closed when the Romans conquered Greece during the first half of the second century B. C.

Professor Doctor Winckelmann had, of course, never seen any of the animals drawn by our prehistoric cavemen and we can therefore hardly blame him for his ignorance. But all the mastodons and bisons of the caves of the Dordogne would not in any way have made him change his mind. For he was the obstinate donkey who insisted that no Greek statue had ever been covered with paint (they had been as gaudy as the Christmas cards of your Italian grocer). We also owe it to his preposterous interference that all plaster casts of classical works of art stare at us from lifeless eyes instead of being provided with that one dot of black which would give them expression and animation. Yes, Winckelmann did his job of professorial *Schrecklichkeit* with such Teutonic thoroughness that, for a century afterwards, all our notions about the art of the Greeks were completely lop-sided and only now we are beginning to see them in their true perspective.

According to the Winckelmann theory, the ancient Greeks sizzled in

a continuous frenzy of artistic emotion. But a sad disillusionment awaits the sober-minded investigator who takes out his old and trusted Greek dictionary and looks up the Greek word for "artist." He finds it to be *technikés* and those letters betray its humble origin, for a *tekton* was a carpenter in ancient Hellas, the Latin verb *texere* meant to weave and our word "technical" too implies "a particular skill in matters pertaining to the useful or mechanical arts." The Greeks therefore felt the same way about their artists as my own ancestors did, who called an artist a man versed in *Kunst*. And it takes no profound knowledge of philology to recognize in the Dutch word *kunst* a close cousin of that Anglo-Saxon verb "to ken," which is familiar to all lovers of Robert Burns, and which is the Scottish equivalent of the more familiar English "to can" or "to know."

Musicians will remember that in the days when the German tongue was still spoken by people of cultivation (long before the introduction of *Kulture)*, Franz Schubert, whenever he was presented to a young artist, used to ask, "Does he know anything? *Kann er was?*" And that most lovable among the composers of the old Austrian Empire approached the problem from the right angle. For there is really only one thing that is important in judging an artist: does he know his job and know it well?

THE Greeks with their true sense of values maintained the same standards of perfection. The artist either had to be good or become a hod-carrier. But those who so enthusiastically talk of "democratic art" and "art for the masses" should remember that the better sort of art has always been a matter of "the few," of "the best" or the "aristocrats," as the Greeks called them.

But how about the endless wars in which the Greeks engaged themselves until the Romans grew tired of all this unrest so near to their own borders and incorporated Hellas into their empire? These wars seem to have come and gone without really making much more difference in the lives of the artists than in those of the fishermen, the merchants or the peasants. Those who imagine the old Hellenes as a race of enlightened philosophers, spending their days out on a mountain-side leisurely discussing the true meaning of life, are victims of the nonsense printed about them by the romantic school of Professor Winckelmann. For the ancient Greeks had been the exact counterpart of their modern descendants—an unruly crew of small town politicians, who whenever they conquered another city or village murdered off all the men, sold the women and children into slavery and destroyed the public buildings with a ruthless efficiency which has rarely been equalled until, in our own day, Benito Mussolini turned his flying-men loose upon the defenseless hamlets of Spain.

That, and the subsequent depredations on the part of the Romans and the Barbarians, accounts for the fact that hardly a single authentic piece of sculpture has come down to us from the so-called classical period of ancient Hellas. The Romans were a little better in this respect than the uncouth Barbarians who followed in their wake and who would grind the most beautiful pieces of sculpture into dust whenever they needed fresh building materials.

As for the Turks who ruled all this part of the Mediterranean for so many centuries, they were almost completely devoid of any sense of beauty (in our sense of the word) but they were too lazy to demolish those works of art that did not directly interfere with their military operations. Hence it was possible for the Acropolis to survive practically intact until the year 1687. Then the Venetians besieged Athens. The Turks had turned the Parthenon into a powder-house. The Teutonic commander of the Venetian squadron decided to center his fire upon the ancient temple of the Virgin Goddess Athena. He was only too successful, for a bullet hit the Turkish powder kegs and the Parthenon was destroyed in the same year in which Harvard celebrated its fiftieth commencement.

Art of course suffers from war but it often takes a very long time before the results make themselves felt. The pyramids of Egypt did not really begin to deteriorate until four thousand years after they had been erected, when the Turks deprived them of their outer covering to obtain material for their mosques and barracks.

As for the Roman artists, the greater part of them were either clever and gifted slaves or talented freedmen and that may be the reason why so little is known to us about the private lives of any of them. Unlike

HENDRIK WILLEM VAN LOON sees two types of tides everyday. One is the tide from Long Island Sound which rolls up near the porch of his home in Connecticut. The other is a tide from the postoffice in the form of hundreds of pleas to Van Loon to head organizations or launch committees. Van Loon is the most sought-after leader of causes in America, though he seldom has time to accommodate all these requests. He is too busy leading causes of his own. He is currently engaged in organizing the campaign for Finnish relief funds.

Van Loon has spent years in cultivating what he felt to be an intelligent and comprehensive set of prejudices—against Nazis, against Communists, against dilettantes, against badly played music, against bad gravies which spoil good steaks, against George Bernard Shaw, ("What can you expect of an old man living off dried-up, badly-cooked vegetables?") against people who don't know geography, and against anyone who hasn't read *Our Battle*, Van Loon's answer to *Mein Kampf*.

He is fifty-eight, was born in Rotterdam, studied at Cornell and Harvard, became an Associated Press correspondent in Washington and later in Russia and Poland. For a number of years he taught history and art. There followed almost two dozen books, among them *Rembrandt van Rijn*, which many consider to be his finest, *The Story of Mankind, The Story of the Bible*, and *The Arts*, selected by CURRENT HISTORY'S Literary Advisory Board as one of the ten outstanding non-fiction books of 1937.

their brethren of the literary profession, they attracted no more attention than a modern engineer or architect who erects a magnificent bridge or imposing building. (Do I exaggerate? How many readers can give me the names of the men who built the Brooklyn or George Washington bridges and New York's Grand Central Station?) These artists invariably worked for an immediate market. No one had ever heard the nonsense about "art for art's sake." When one needed a statue for one's garden, one went to the sculptor who had the best reputation for that sort of thing. And when one desired to make the *atrium* of one's house look a little more cheerful, one hired the services of a slave who was handy wih a brush. And since none of those artists expected anything different, they remained what artists had always been, better-class craftsmen.

THE Roman Empire took an unconscionably long time in falling. It successfully survived an endless series of Barbarian attacks, for the wandering tribes from the East, who now began to move westward in search of better living conditions, were still so awed by the prestige of the imperial idea that they hastened to make themselves just as Roman as they could the moment they set foot on the territory of the old empire. In this respect they were very much like our own immigrants from the darkest corners of the European hinterland, who will hastily discard everything that still binds them to the traditions of the home-countries, the moment they have passed through Ellis Island.

But Rome was at last defeated and Roman civilization came to an end.

That (the loss of Rome's sea power at the hands of the Moslems) was the true beginning of the Dark Ages. Art then fell upon evil days. But it was not war which destroyed the chances of the artist. He merely shared the fate of all more or less civilized persons. The whole of society collapsed and, when that happens, the artist is of course one of the first to go. For how could he make a living in a world in which cities like Rome had seen their population dwindle down from over a million to a little less than twenty thousand? Where could he set up shop when all the centers of culture in western Europe had been reduced to mere agricultural villages? How could he hope to work for an international market (as he had done in the old imperial days) when all roads had fallen into decay, when every bridge had been destroyed and when no man was safe, once he had left his own well-fortified bailiwick? There was only one place where the artist could still expect to find that quietude and seclusion which he needs whenever he is engaged upon his creative labors. The cloister offered him a safe retreat and art escaped from the desolated countryside and hid behind the walls of the convent. And there it remained until the feudal barons, the Tammany men of the Middle Ages, had reestablished some sort of order in the midst of the appalling state of chaos which finally had threatened to destroy the whole of the old continent.

The recuperative powers of the human race are apparently unlimited. For in less than a single century after the disappearance of anarchy, there was such renewed activity in every department of life that once more the artist was given a chance to open up shop, to hang out his shingle and to await the arrival of prospective customers. In a society dominated by the Church and the nobility, he had to work for a restricted class of people with very definite notions of what they wanted and did not want. But in this the clerics and the barons were not different from the present patrons of the arts, for art has always followed the full dinner-pail and the architect and the painter and sculptor and even the musician, if they want to live, must "work to please" or run the risk of seeing their wives and children committed to the poor-house.

The era from the beginning of the Middle Ages to the end of the Rococo was one of incessant warfare. How did it affect the artist? Hardly at all, for wars were not national affairs which affected every man, woman, child, dog and cow in the whole country. Wars were large-scale tournaments fought out between professionals. Unless they lost their temper or were careless with their candles when invading the wine cellar of a rich burgher and set fire to an entire city, comparatively little art was destroyed. And as the artist, with the exception of such men as Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci—the former a veritable Hercules and the latter a very ingenious military engineer—was usually a misfit as a soldier, he was rarely disturbed by the recruiting officer. And indeed, we have ample proof to show that the wars of this period rarely interfered with the placid existence of the artist.

Antonio Stradivarius, the great violin maker of Cremona, seems to have lived through two sieges of his native town without ever so much as noticing them or ceasing his endless labors on account of any direct inconvenience caused by the siege guns of the enemy. Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote his *Social Contract* and his *Confessions* while a small-scale world-war raged in eastern Europe, but he never mentioned either. Old man Hegel, the German philosopher who became the spiritual grandfather of Hitlerism, finished reading proof on his *Phenomenology* slightly annoyed by the noise of a distant cannonade. The next day, when he carried the proofs to the printer, he wondered why there suddenly were so many soldiers in the streets of Jena. It apparently had not yet dawned upon him that twenty-four hours before the Emperor Napoleon had destroyed the armies of the King of Prussia within sight of the walls of his own city.

Goethe was actually present at the battle of Valmy, which opened up the gates of Europe to the victorious armies of the Revolution. Being a discerning sort of person, he jotted down in his diary that that day meant "the beginning of a new era," and thereupon peacefully returned to his tranquil literary labors as if the whole of the world around him were not actually in flames.

When the French occupied Vienna, the first thing they did was to place a guard of honor before the door of Papa Haydn, that the old man might not be disturbed by marauders.

I could continue to give you page upon page of similar examples to show you how little in those days wars affected the lives of the artists.

All of the great Dutch painters spent their days in an atmosphere of war, for Holland was rarely at peace during the whole of the seventeenth century. Except for a very rare piece of patriotic allegory (ordered to celebrate some new triumph or conquest), they might have been working on the planet Saturn for all they noticed of the violence at their own doors.

Sometimes, when their countries suffered a temporary defeat, as happened at the moment of Rembrandt's greatest glory, a financial crisis might occur which caused them considerable money difficulties and might land them in the bankruptcy court. But the case of Spinoza (an artist of the idea) shows clearly how completely apart the lives of most private citizens were from the furors of war. In the year 1672, the armies of Louis XIV invaded the Low Countries. A sudden cold spell had allowed them to cross the inundated regions and they seemed to have the country completely at their mercy, when an equally unexpected thaw drove them back whence they had come. But these bitter hostilities did not prevent the French commander-in-chief from bidding the eminent Spinoza to visit him at his headquarters and discuss the possibilities of a professorial chair in one of the French universities for this amiable sage.

And so it went. Of course, when there was so much shooting, there were bound to be certain mishaps, as the ruins of the castle of Heidelberg show in such a painful and unmistakable manner. But as long as Europe enjoyed a universal form of culture, that is to say, until the end of the era of the Rococo and the beginning of the revolutionary period, wars hardly affected the lives of the artists, and since they did not affect their mode of thinking and feeling, they did not make any profound impression upon their creative activities and abilities.

Then what destroyed that "universality of culture" which has made the existence of the artist such a difficult and painful one?

Nationalism, dear reader, the nationalism born out of the ideas of the French Revolution and carried all over Europe by the great traveling-salesman of the revolutionary ideals, Napoleon Bonaparte.

I hate to indict an idea in such a wholesale manner as I am doing right here and now. But it is the narrow, bigoted and restricted form of nationalism which followed in the wake of the widespread internationalism of the era of the Rococo which is really at the bottom of most of our present ills. For when the ideological nationalism of the twentieth century was added to the political nationalism of the nineteenth century, then we were all of us completely lost, not merely the artist, the writer and the scientist, but also you and I and our children and—God forbid!—our grandchildren, too, unless we shall find some way out and are able to save ourselves before it is too late and the whole of our civilization shall have been annihilated by the Juggernaut of Bolshevism, Fascism and Hitlerism.

The artist, being doomed by his profession to be much more of an individualist than most other people, held out longest of all. But the Stalins, the Hitlers and the Mussolinis (and all their big and little imitators) have been able to do what no mediæval pope or Baroque king has ever quite succeeded in bringing about. They have put the soul of the artist in a spiritual concentration camp. He now must become either a propagandist of the prevailing philosophy of life or accept death by slow starvation and systematic contempt.

The artist is often a person of sincere convictions and he will therefore fight bitterly for his independence

and his personal integrity. Often he will hold out against his new masters with admirable courage and tenacity. But while he himself can probably bear the pangs of hunger and neglect, he is apt to give in when he sees his family being reduced to a state of beggary.

Hence, the arts have fallen upon evil days.

There is no room in the totalitarian state for the Genius, who is endowed with a vision of beauty of his own. Indeed, there is no room in the totalitarian state for any sort of freedom. And since all art in order to be genuine and sincere must be allowed to develop in an atmosphere of absolute spiritual liberty, art for the present, at least, has fallen upon evil days.

This is not a very hopeful conclusion, but as General Gamelin, the philosopher in command of the French armies, observed so wisely at the beginning of the war: "There is no use getting angry at unpleasant facts, for our wrath will hardly cause them to change."

Therefore let us face these facts and draw the logical conclusions. We must either fight to maintain our hard-earned liberties or we must accept defeat and give up our art.

I realize that this is a difficult choice, but I am afraid that there is no other. At least, not for the men and women of America of the year of disgrace, 1940.

THEY SAY
Quotations from the World Press

Exchange Control Ahead?

—Condensed from The Foreign Observer & Survey of World Trade Trends, *New York*

An industrialist usually in the know anticipates establishment of foreign exchange control in the United States to implement the Hull reciprocal trade agreements policy. "Countervailing control" has never been feasible in this country. Banks have generally been too individualistic for an unofficial bank-agreement to be possible, and the Administration has viewed exchange control as contrary to the principles of the Hull program. That was when three-quarters of our exports (not to mention foreign investments) went to countries exercising no exchange restrictions against us.

Today we are much differently situated: less than one-fourth of our export trade is with "free-exchange" nations and banks here have learned to work in harness. Some members of the Administration, with elections approaching, and the Hull program due for a pounding, see in countervailing control of foreign exchange the one militant weapon with which to retort.

One by one, and very quietly, the members of the British Commonwealth have set up means of enforcing a "Buy in the British Empire" program. This, coupled with Argentina's logical (but, from the Hull viewpoint, politically ill-timed) declaration of economic fealty to Britain, has edged the reciprocal trade agreements program farther onto the spot.

To top which, *The London Economist*, which does not often misfire in its forecasts of British trends, reflects that "it would be a mistake to rule out all possibility of [England's] adopting a modified version of the same technical device" [as employed by Germany with its ASKI-marks] "for sterling merely because it had been perverted in Germany to undesirable ends. . . . When obvious abuses are removed there are legitimate uses of differential exchange values for the same currency. There are some countries in respect to which we can legitimately practice the technique of the exchange clearing which has been the outstanding feature of Germany's trade with the Balkans in recent years."

Though *The Economist* refers to the suggested adoption of some of Germany's foreign-trade tactics (so much hated in Washington) as "wartime export policy," American foreign traders find no basis for optimism in the recollection that pre-War British competition in certain parts of the world was much the same piece of policy.

At the moment, the sole surviving "free exchange" countries besides the United States are Argentina, Ecuador, Cuba (these three have modified exchange control), Mexico, Haiti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, Peru, Venezuela, Portugal, Switzerland, Belgium, The Netherlands, Liberia, Syria, Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, Thai-land (Siam), and the Philippines, aggregating 15 per cent of the earth's population. Our balance of payments (exports, imports, gold shipments, tourist spending, insurance payments and other items) left the United States debtor to the other nations of this group to the amount of about $485 millions in 1937; $330 millions in 1938; and $860 millions at the end of September 1939. The bulk of this, however, represents what we owe on gold imports.

Stock "Dumping" Unlikely

—Condensed from an editorial in The New York Herald Tribune

The Federal Reserve Board has just completed a study of the gold holdings, dollar balances and American investments of foreign countries. This survey should tend to reassure those who have been apprehensive as to the effects on American markets of the possible liquidation of "billions of dollars' worth" of stocks and bonds held by British and French nationals here.

That the Allies have at their disposal a huge volume of assets, a large part of which can be mobilized for purchases here, is corroborated by the board's report. But only a very small fraction of this sum is represented by securities which could be "dumped" in the American market. Gold, dollar balances and American investments of the United Kingdom, France, Canada and other British and French countries are estimated at $9,980 millions, all told. But of this total $5,755 millions, or 58 per cent, is accounted for by gold reserves. Another $1,265 millions, or 12.7 per cent, is in the form of dollar deposits here. Direct investments represent an additional $1,540 millions, or 15.4 per cent. "Direct investments" are investments in controlled enterprises, such as railways, mines, oil wells, manufacturing enterprises and real estate. Some of these assets are in the United States, but a large part are held in other countries.

After deducting these holdings we find that the residue, representing "readily negotiable securities," is about $1,420 millions, or a little over 14 per cent of the aggregate. If we break this item down farther we find that the holdings of the two active belligerents, Britain and France, amount, respectively, to but $735,000,000 and $185,000,000, or $920 millions all told. But we can go a step beyond that.

The Reserve Board's figures cover the situation as of the end of August. According to the best information

available the British have been liquidating securities here at the rate of about $1,000,000 a day for some three months. If this is the case, then it is probably safe to assume that British and French holdings are nearer $850 millions than $920 millions.

This, obviously, is quite a different picture from that which has been conjured up by the more pessimistic market observers, some of whom have seemed to be under the impression that the Allies would finance their entire participation in the war through the liquidation of investments here. It is worth recalling that even in 1914-18 only about one-sixth of the American export balance was met through such liquidation. The chief resort of the Allies on that occasion was foreign loans.

It is true that in the case of the present war the British and French are debarred from loans in this market by the Johnson act. On the other hand, they are in a far stronger position in the size of their gold holdings and in the increase in the annual rate of gold production. In 1914 the central gold reserves of Great Britain and France amounted to $165 millions and $680 millions, respectively, or $845 millions combined. In addition, these countries had a total of $1,565 millions in gold currency in circulation, a large part of which was recalled and added to bank reserves. But in those years countries were less willing than today to permit their gold reserves to go out of the country. Today England and France have $5,000 millions in gold which, presumably, they are prepared to spend on war supplies, while gold production subject to their control amounts to $750 millions a year.

In the light of these considerations, and in further view of the fact that the Allies are conducting their affairs on the assumption that the war is to be a long one, there would seem to be little reason to fear any serious "dumping" of foreign security holdings here.

Homework

—Reprinted from a contribution by Christopher Billopp in The Evening Sun, *Baltimore*

It's 7.30 o'clock and Johnny is sitting there making a pocket in his lacrosse stick and asking no end of questions. And you suggest to him that it is about time for him to go upstairs and get to work on his lessons.

And Johnny says he hasn't got any lessons. And you say that is rather surprising, as the teachers have told you that he ought to do at least an hour and a half of homework. And you inquire, "How about arithmetic?" And he says he has done all of his arithmetic, as he had so many study periods at school.

And you ask him about his English. And Johnny says he can't study the English, as the lesson for tomorrow is a composition and you can't write a composition in advance. So you ask him why he should not work on his geography. And he says there is no geography tomorrow. You counter he might do his geography for day after tomorrow. But Johnny says that will do no good, as he will have forgotten it by day after tomorrow.

You say, nevertheless, you are not going to let him waste the whole evening just sitting there making a pocket in a lacrosse stick and asking questions, and that he can at least go upstairs and get himself a good book that will improve his mind and help his English and give him background. He says there isn't any book to read, as he has read all of the books in the house that are really interesting.

By that time you have just about run out of ideas. But what you can't understand is how it happens that a boy who has ever so many study periods at school and is so beautifully prepared in all his subjects and is, according to his own opinion, getting on so swimmingly in all lines, should, at the end of the week, bring back such a discouraging report.

For Students Only

—Condensed from an editorial in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

It is a small college—St. John's, at Annapolis, Md. It has 124 students, a faculty of 25. It is smaller than Dartmouth was when Daniel Webster pleaded for his alma mater's life before the Supreme Court. Yet, prospectively, St. John's may today be the biggest college in the U. S.

Scholarly judgment has so deposed. Walter Lippmann looks upon St. John's as "the seedbed of the American Renaissance." And Milton S. Mayer, gazing beyond its modest roofs, shabby purse and meager repute, sees an institution that, "by its very existence, threatens every college and university in America."

The story of St. John's, is breathtaking, quite incredible, the stuff of romance, the dream coming true of a pair of intellectual knight-errants.

Dismiss as hopelessly beyond the pale the man or woman who isn't thrilled to the marrow to meet such visionaries as Stringfellow Barr of Virginia and Scott Buchanan of Washington. By diversely studious ways, they came as Rhodes scholars to Balliol College, Oxford. Later, prospering as teachers, their work attracted the vigilant Dr. Hutchins, who brought them to Chicago. Chance, in a quizzical mood, and talking preposterously out of turn, told them about a little college, very old, very ill, about to die.

Here was a fine opening for an impractical educator to toss away his career, tackle the impossible and go clattering down to failure on a spavined Rosinante. Chance tapped the right fellows. Barr accepted the presidency, Buchanan became dean of teaching, and in the fall of 1937 St. John's started on its glorious adventure into pure, undefiled learning for learning's laureled goal.

The idler, the athletic star, the colorless majority of youthful indifference who go to college because there is nothing else to do—for such there is no St. John's. St. John's is dedicated to the plain living and high thinking of the studious life. It is a temple of scholarship. No option spreads its temptation there. Elective courses are taboo. It is "must" all the way: Greek, Latin, mathematics, laboratory hours.

The one pervasive, comprehensive adjective is "great." Here the student lives with the great books of the great minds "from Aristotle to Zola," in all the superior explorations, with never

a trace of the vocational. The sole objective of St. John's is to turn out disciplined men who can read, write and think.

Eighteen Past Eight

—Reprinted from an article by N. S. Olds in The Villager, *New York*

Do you remember how the painted hands on the old watchmakers' signs always pointed to 18 minutes past 8? We learned why the other day. The time set was no accident, but an agreement, based on a tragic historical event. And in a way, fortunate for the watchmakers. Being in a big clock and watch show-room recently, we noticed that all the clocks on the walls had all stopped at that hour. Curious, we hailed a salesman. "Result of a local earthquake?" we wittily queried. "Earthquake? No," he replied. "Abraham Lincoln was shot at that hour."

Then the story broke for us. A patriotic watch and clock man, to commemorate the death of Lincoln, had the painters point the hands of his big, new sign to the exact moment of Booth's fatal shot, and told the world why. Immediately everybody else in the business followed his example from coast to coast. It became a trade custom, and has endured even down to today, when electric clocks can be plugged into any baseboard, and key winders are gone with Nineveh and Tyre. We gazed pensively. "The hands display well, too, at that hour," we murmured. "Yes," assented the salesman, "that helped some, too, I suspect."

Refugee Dogs

—Condensed from The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

A national campaign to obtain homes in the United States for fine English hunting dogs as well as the pure strain of other breeds for the duration of the European war has been undertaken by Mrs. Gilbert P. Strelinger, vice-president of the American Pointer Club, who maintains Larmargil Kennels as a hobby at her St. Louis County home.

Mrs. Strelinger has acquainted English breeders with her plan and has written the principal dog fanciers of this country and secretaries of clubs devoted to various breeds. She has received many favorable replies and is endeavoring to get in touch with breeders in other warring countries besides Great Britain.

In her letter to English breeders Mrs. Strelinger mentioned the possibility that the exigencies of war might result in the necessity of destroying pets which have made Great Britain "famous in the dog world and possibly setting back the breeding of fine dogs several generations."

"If there is any question of such a step having to be taken," she said. "I feel very strongly that I want to find some way to help and that now is the time to begin thinking of ways and means for the saving of at least a good nucleus of the breeding stock with which a new start could be made."

The Finns Are Like That

—From The Christian Science Monitor

Ninety-nine in every one hundred Finns can read and write. Finland's high literacy owes much to religion. During the Reformation hundreds of years ago, leaders of the Finnish Protestant Church wanted all Finns to be able to study for themselves the newly translated Bible and other religious books. Hence the emphasis upon education. Today more books are said to be sold per person in Finland than in any other country. Stockman's bookstore in Helsingfors is rated the world's largest.

During 1938, more than 350,000,000 pieces of mail were handled in the Helsingfors Post Office, not counting inter-urban mail. This alone means an average of one hundred letters and newspapers for every man, woman, and child in Finland.

Finland has always insisted on self-government or at least a large measure of autonomy. Czarist Russia gave Finland a semi-independent status. After the war of 1914-18, Finland received full independence from Communist Russia, now again seeking to subjugate the country.

Finns are great linguists. Many of them speak five languages, most of them two or more. They are intensely serious, but have a sense of humor withal.

Finnish honesty is a proverb. One of three American travelers left his camera in a train loaded with soldiers. He did not discover the loss until reaching his hotel. No name was on the camera, nor any identification. In about fifteen minutes a Post Office official arrived in a taxi with the camera. He had made the rounds of hotels in the small city of Kuopio, until he found one where three Americans had just checked in.

When asked why they pay their debt to the United States, although many nations, including Britain and France, have defaulted, Finns reply: "We owed it." Apparently the thought never occurs of trying to avoid payment.

Finland's financial budget has always been balanced as soon as possible at whatever sacrifice. The national debt has been reduced steadily. A reserve fund of about 1,000,000,000 finmarks ($20,000,000) has been built in a few years.

Americans and others who arrive with superiority complexes soon have to change their notions. Hotels are ultra-modern. Apartments have sun decks. There are no slums in Helsinki.

The Finns are like that.

Wartime Correspondence Under Nazi Censorship

—Condensed from the column "Take a Look" by W. L. White in The New York Post.

EDITOR'S NOTE: W. L. White has left Berlin for Helsinki. Excerpts from Mr. White's letters to Mrs. White, which follow, give such a clear picture of the conditions under which foreign observers are working, that they have been made the basis for today's column.

BERLIN, Nov. 14 (By Mail)—There is a good deal of red tape getting permission to cable; they've finally promised it definitely for tomorrow, so I couldn't file anything on the Munich affair, and I had a pretty good story, too. I have not heard a single solitary word from America since I left. Have no idea what you or my family or the newspapers are doing, or if my stuff is getting through.

It is absolutely forbidden here for foreigners to wire out any kind of message, which is the reason I haven't been able to let you know I was finally in Germany, although I've been here

a week. I am staying here at the Bristol Hotel, but expect to move to the Continental where the correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor* has a radio.

It's an American radio; they're the only ones that will get foreign stations. The local ones have the names of all the foreign stations printed on the dial, but for some very curious reason all you get are stations inside this country.

* * *

BERLIN, Nov. 25 (By Mail)—Today I received my first word from America since I sailed. Your two cables forwarded from Rome. Thank God you are still alive.

There is about as much tension here now as on a hot Sunday afternoon in Kansas. (Note: Mr. White's allusion here is obviously not an offhand one. A native Kansan, he had spent many of those hot Sunday afternoons which try the souls and nerves of men waiting to see whether the gathering storm will pass, or break in all its fury, sweeping away a life's work in an afternoon.)

The trouble with the Clipper service is that the British are said to be taking our mailbags off the ship at Bermuda, holding it a week while they read everything, and putting it back on the next Clipper a week later. (Note: Mrs. White comments that it appears doubtful that the British are holding any of the mail, and certainly have not opened any of the mail received thus far.)

I only got my permission to send cables today, and can only send press messages to *The New York Post*, as private telegrams of any nature are absolutely forbidden, but of course the government lets you tack personal messages on the end of these.

Thank God, you bought me the wool bathrobe. I'd be dead of pneumonia without it. There is plenty of coal here and the people are happy and loyal to the regime: almost as much coal and loyalty and happiness as in the Harlan, Ky., coal fields, but Italy was cold as hell in the hotel rooms.

Under a new arrangement the Propaganda Ministerium very kindly offers to handle our mail for us. They take our letters, either personal or to newspapers, and have them retyped on Ministerium stationery and then mail them, retaining the original in case you or any one should ever get curious as to exactly what it was you wrote, and then put the copy into a Ministerium envelope and then, since it has already been read in Berlin to see that it contains no military or other objectionable information, it is not held for military censorship at the border, but goes direct by Clipper to the British, who delay it some more and then you get it.

It was unofficially intimated that the reason for this was that some of the Balkan journalists just might have been writing in invisible ink on their copy, so the recopying obviates any chemical tests. Any spiritual tests necessary are conducted in the Ministerium. Of course, we are still free to use the old channels if we like, but most of the boys are now doing it this way because it *should* be quicker, and you may be sure that it is a very great convenience indeed.

It will be nice to be back in a country where a sudden automobile backfire in the street cannot possibly be mistaken for a change of administration.

Le Canard Enchaîné, Paris

Berlin blackout: "Run, Gretchen, here comes Goering!"

Latin America Closed to Nazi Germany

—Condensed from The Latin-American World

When Hitler boasts of the economic help which he is "assured" by his new-found ally, Soviet Russia, it is as well to remember that the extent of such Russian assistance is, to say the least, problematical, while there is no doubt at all about the complete loss of his most important source of vital raw materials and foodstuffs—Latin America.

The British naval policeman now stands four-square between Hitler and his favourite overseas shop. His shifty neighbour may by some new miracle of intensified production and improved transport supply a few items on the now strictly verboten Latin American shopping list; but, however prodigal Hitler may be with his material and spiritual pledges, Uncle Joe's pawnshop stock happens also to be limited in range and in many cases does not suffice to meet home needs.

Below there are listed in alphabetical order some of the goods bought from the Latin American storehouse in vast quantities by Nazi Germany. Score out the items which the Russians claim, often quite unconvincingly, that they can supply in great volume, and the result will give you a good idea of Hitler's desperate plight.

These are the raw materials and foodstuffs which Germany normally buys from Latin America, which is in many cases either her principal or exclusive supplier of a particular product.

Antimony, balata, balsam, bananas, barley, beef extract, bismuth, cacao, canned meats, carnauba wax, chicle, cocoa, coconuts, coffee, copper, corn, cotton, fruits, henequen, hides, indigo, ivory nuts, iron ore, lead, linseed, logwood, lumber, mahogany, meat and by-products of the cattle industry, molasses, nitrate and iodine, oats, oil seeds and kernels, petroleum, platinum, quebracho extract, rice, rubber, rum, silver, sisal, sponges, sugar, tin, tobacco and cigars, wheat, wolfram, wool, and zinc.

And there won't be any "Panama" hats from Ecuador or butter from Argentina for unassuming, ascetic Hermann Goering.

German View: Revolution in England

—Condensed from Deutsche Bergwerks-Zeitung

"*'It's a long way to Tipperary'* dies hard, doesn't it? How long-lived rubbish is!" This remark was only recently made by an English author, Wyndham Lewis, and now we have a new song for the English soldier: two British anti-aircraft gunners have composed it, and the wireless is doing its best to make it popular:

"We're going to hang out the washing on the Siegfried Line.
Have you any dirty washing, mother dear?
We're going to hang out the washing on the Siegfried Line,
For washing day is here.
Whether the weather is wet or fine,
We'll rub along without a care.
We're going to hang out the washing on the Siegfried Line,
If the Siegfried Line's still there!"

Poor Tommy, so misled about the seriousness of the task intended for you, marching all unsuspecting to the Western Wall as though to a cheery hanging up of washing! For it's a long way to the Siegfried Line, as you will soon learn!

The same frivolity, the same deception revealed by this soldier's song, characterize the attitude of Chamberlain and his government, not only towards Germany and the neutral countries, but towards their own fellow-countrymen. Chamberlain could have spared the world and England incalculable sacrifices, if he had only wanted to. A single word would have sufficed—he did not speak it. . . . When all is over, the world will be able to point to the little clique which has forced its will on the English people.

English politicians have stated that this war, whoever gains the victory, must end in a social revolution in England such as has never yet been seen. After the World War it was possible to retard this revolution, but the English masses have never ceased to ask themselves, what did *they* gain from beating Germany to her knees during four long years of hardship, or indeed from the British Empire itself? The misery of the slums and unemployment cry to heaven. The Englishman, Belloc, has said that the chief characteristic of English social life is the way in which the people are being more and more dispossessed, and so becoming what is generally known as a proletariat. From the collection of wealth in the hands of the few and the control of production by individuals, great masses of dependent paupers have arisen.

Le Populaire, Paris

"Well, what shall we do?"
"That depends. What haven't they said we might do?"

He who is not a gentleman is no better than a slave, states Wyndham Lewis. The social machine works one-sidedly against anyone who is "not quite," who can't pronounce "H" and "G" properly. "I for my part would far rather be born a real slave in a Greek or Roman City State than in the British working class," he says.

If we remember how it has been one of the chief works of National Socialist statesmen to do away with class prejudice, we can grasp the deep significance of the Führer's words at the opening of the Winter Help campaign: "In connection with this great social institution we have done a very great deal towards wiping out class differences in the German nation and towards arousing a consciousness of community. . . . We have achieved such great social successes that we perhaps might find in them one of the reasons for a certain disfavor in the outside world, which is horrified at the thought that the socialist-national principles of our Reich might have a propagandist effect beyond our frontiers and perhaps shake up consciences in this respect in other countries."

The war against Germany is not the English people's affair. They will only be still further oppressed in consequence of it. It is the affair of a little master-class, of whom Wyndham Lewis says that on the occasion of former wars they have had the "stage management" in their hands, and have misused this position to rob three-quarters of their countrymen. . . .

The danger of a social revolution which Chamberlain and his clique have conjured up by senselessly unleashing war against Germany, is made all the greater by the fact that this war is causing the English people sufferings in comparison with which the restrictions and deprivations of the World War simply do not count. . . . The cry: "What are we suffering for?" will ring ever louder in England, the longer the war goes on. Chamberlain is risking an end to the out-of-date economic and social structure of his country. He is risking it unnecessarily. Truly, those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make blind!

"World Peace Means Revolution"

—Extract from an article by H. G. Wells in The Fortnightly, *London*

Today there is war to get rid of Adolf Hitler who has taken the part of the Hohenzollerns. He too has outraged the Club Rules and he too is to be expelled. The war, the Chamberlain-Hitler War, is being waged so far by the British Empire in quite the old spirit. It has learnt nothing and forgotten nothing. There is the same resolute disregard of any more fundamental problem.

Still the minds of our comfortable and influential ruling-class people refuse to accept the plain intimation that their time is over, that the Balance of Power and uncontrolled business methods cannot continue, and that Hitler, like the Hohenzollerns, is a mere offensive pustule on the face of a deeply ailing world. To get rid of him and his Nazis will be no more a cure for the world's ills than scraping will heal measles. The disease will manifest itself in some new eruption. It is the system of nationalist individualism and uncoordinated enterprise that is the world's disease and it is the whole system that has to go. It has to be reconditioned down to its foundations or replaced. It cannot hope to "muddle through" amiably, wastefully and dangerously, a second time.

World peace means all that much revolution. More and more of us begin to realize that it cannot mean less.

The first thing therefore that has to be done in thinking out the primary problems of a world peace is to realize this, that we are living in the end of a definite period of history, the period of the sovereign states. As we

used to say in the eighties with ever-increasing truth: "We are in an age of transition." Now we get some measure of the acuteness of the transition. It is a phase of human life which may lead either to *a new way of living* for our species or else to a longer or briefer *degringolade* of violence, misery, destruction, death and the extinction of mankind. These are not rhetorical phrases I am using here; I mean exactly what I say, the disastrous extinction of mankind.

That is the issue before us. It is no small affair of parlor politics we have to consider. As I write, in this moment, thousands of people are being killed, wounded, hunted, tormented, ill-treated, delivered up to the most intolerable and hopeless anxiety and destroyed morally and mentally, and there is nothing in sight at present to arrest this spreading process and prevent its reaching you and yours. It is coming for you and yours now at a great pace. Plainly in so far as we are rational foreseeing creatures there is nothing for any of us now but to make this world peace problem the ruling interest and direction of our lives. If we run away from it it will pursue and get us. We have to face it. We have to solve it or be destroyed by it. It is as urgent and comprehensive as that.

In the three cartoons on this page, *Weltwoche*, Zurich chronicles the adventures of two Italian correspondents on a visit to the West Wall.

I. *"I've been listening to the enemy for three hours."*
"What did he say?"
"I don't know. He speaks a different language."

The Napoleonic Phase in Stalin's Russia

—*Condensed from an article in* The London News Chronicle *by Vernon Bartlett, author, editor and Liberal M.P.*

The rulers of Russia have been unkind to their friends. What is a man to do when he discovers that M. Molotov is just as ready as Herr Hitler to turn verbal somersaults and to accuse Chamberlain of aggression, the Finns of war-mongering, and collective security of being an outworn creed?

Intellectual integrity is menaced by prejudice in the case of those supporters of the Soviet Union who now discover that countries as highly civilized as Finland or Sweden—that can shame us with so much of their social legislation—are really nests of reactionary intriguers against the common people.

Moscow's rapid conversion from bitter hostility to Hitler to a benevolent neutrality towards him may cause no puzzled headaches in a country where freedom of discussion is unknown, but it places others outside Russia in front of a desperately difficult dilemma.

They have for so long sought to convince themselves that the Soviet Union could do no wrong. Are they now, in the presence of so much evidence that it has many of the same weaknesses as other forms of government, to excuse or to accuse it?

But the Russian Revolution is merely going the same way as all other revolutions, and it would be folly to expect anything else. The reaction of men in authority towards a new revolutionary idea is, and must be, a determination to crush it. It is a menace to their existence and they are too alarmed to reflect that it will thrive under oppression.

Who can tell how much Bolshevism benefited from our own Mr. Winston Churchill's encouragement of the futile counter-revolutionary expeditions of men like General Wrangel and Yudenitch?

The imperialism of Napoleon grew out of the attempts of the neighbors of France to destroy the French Revolution. Inevitably, out of the capitalist dislike of the Russian Revolution there is growing a new Russian imperialism. Three years or more ago I ventured the prophecy that the Moscow government was approaching its Napoleonic phase, and that Communism must give way to Nationalism.

One wonders whether any man in Europe would be more worried by a Communist revolution in Germany than Joseph Stalin, for his country, under his management, has evolved a long way from the doctrines of October 1917. The fear of Trotskyism, which has driven hundreds of Russians to execution or exile, would become an obsession if Russia's western neighbor "went Communist."

If Russia does not want a Communist neighbor, why does she now favor Hitler in a struggle the prolongation of which must lead towards

II. *"It's lucky you came along or we'd have had to move these funny stones ourselves."*

III. *"Now it's my turn to watch the behavior of the enemy."*

a whole series of revolutions? Surely because her leaders are just as frightened of an Anglo-Franco-German block against them as some of our leaders are frightened of a Russo-German block against us.

In her view, she must decide what sort of peace there is to be in Germany, and in order to do so she must help Hitler until Great Britain and France are too weak to impose an "imperialist" peace upon his country. It is in Stalin's interest, in the early stages of the war, but only in the early stages, to encourage what he believes to be the losing side.

Does Japan Menace the Philippines?

—Condensed from The Japan Times Weekly, *Tokyo*

Paul V. McNutt, predecessor of Francis B. Sayre as American High Commissioner in the Philippines, is a staunch proponent of American retention of the Philippines, advocating "re-examination" of the Independence Law. He did not say so in as many words but it was clear that among the reasons for which he urged American retention of the archipelago was the fear of its falling a prey to Japan once it became completely independent.

Now Mr. Sayre makes it plain that he has already come to the same conclusion. A Manila dispatch reports him as saying at a press conference that "the American government is paying careful consideration regarding the so-called Japanese menace to the Islands."

His remarks, taking for granted the presence of the so-called Japanese menace, are really disappointing. They show Mr. Sayre either swallowed the popular prejudicial notion without due study of the subject or had convinced himself of this "menace" on propaganda handouts while at home.

This Japanese menace bogey is an old, old story. We have been fed up with it and would have passed any reference to it with tolerant laughter if such reference were made by a nobody. But when a man in so exalted a position as the American High Commissioner, personally representing the Chief Executive of the United States, openly mentions it, we believe it an act of courtesy on his part to enlighten us more definitely on the subject.

What is this "Japanese menace"? Point out something that we have done, however unconsciously, that might appear convincingly a menace to the Islands.

We are afraid that no Filipino or any other resident in the Islands can mention a single instance which might justify such accusation, because we have never committed any such action and never will. We have studiously tried to be law abiding "aliens," as they prefer to call us there. We have contributed much toward the constructive work in the Islands. Mr. Sayre will find it interesting to refer to a speech made by President Quezon on July 29, 1938, when, regarding foreigners in the Islands, he declared, in part:

"They have a right to be accorded treatment of equality and justice since they helped develop our country."

To what "foreigners"—who pioneered in industrial activities long before any Filipino moved a finger—President Quezon referred is clear.

We refer Mr. Sayre also to the highest military authority in the Islands, General Douglas McArthur. The General on May 29, 1937, was quoted as stating:

"I would not, could not, think of so absurd an idea as that Japan will invade the Islands one of these days. I have never, in my deed or word, suggested a possibility of Japan's seeking a chance to seize the Islands."

Can the Japanese, whose contribution toward the industrial development of the Islands has merited public appreciation from the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, be considered a menace to the Islands? If this is a menace, it is a constructive "menace" and should be welcomed anywhere, especially in the Philippines where, among natives, diligence, perseverance and stick-to-it-iveness appear none too conspicuous.

Psychological Warfare and How to Wage It

—Condensed from A Handbook of the Modern Science of Defense, by Major General Hermann Franke (published in 1936 by Walter de Gruyter, Leipzig, Germany)

Psychological warfare is the fight conducted by the state with psychological weapons to strengthen its own prestige in the opinion of the world, and to weaken that of the enemy—the fight which is designed to maintain and enhance the defensive forces at home and to lower the enemy's will to resist. Chronologically, psychological warfare does not go hand in hand with military warfare. Frequently it is the forerunner of military warfare and continues after arms have been laid down.

The functions of psychological warfare are: first, to belittle the enemy in the opinion of the world; to convince him of the futility of his efforts; to incite his people against their government; and to tempt them with, and make them listen to, proposals of peace.

Propaganda in the psychological war must attempt to convince neutral countries of one's own love of peace and the justice of one's cause, and of the breach of peace by, and the dangerous character of, the enemy; neutral countries must be moved to render assistance against the enemy.

Again, one's own nation must be strengthened in its belief in the justice of its cause and in its certainty of victory. In a psychological war, power and success are the most effective weapons. Military success by far outbalances even the most persuasive argument and influences world opinion much more profoundly.

The basic prerequisite for effective propaganda at home is the conviction that the war was forced by the enemy. The people must grasp with mind and soul what it is they have to fight, suffer and die for. It must be hammered into their minds that the war means a fight for existence.

Propaganda should make an appeal to the conscience and the sense of duty of the luke-warm, the weak and

the unruly. In the fight to obtain the spiritual support and the full understanding of the people, the government cannot dispense with the intellectuals and must exploit the national heritage and tradition.

Defense forces must be backed up by the support and the sacrifices of the entire people. Only if the people endure with a strong heart deprivations of all kinds, separation and loss of dear ones; only if they can go without worldly goods and traditional rights; only if no one derives personal profit while his neighbor is impoverished—only then will the defense forces and the *hinterland*, high and low, rich and poor, be welded into a unit and summon the necessary strength to hold out.

The success of all these aspirations, however, can be injured by the poison of counter-propaganda. The fight against that poison requires more farsightedness, effort and energy than the open wooing of the support of the people. A strong government, backed by the masses, can close the borders, control foreign mail and interfere with foreign broadcasts in order to keep enemy propaganda from the air, but it is not able to prevent completely the dropping of enemy leaflets, the discouraging gossip of perpetual grumblers, critics, pessimists and enemy agents. To expose such subversive activity and stop the further dissemination of the poison requires, aside from a vigilant police, the assistance of all upright people, who should participate in the fight against this plague from a sense of duty.

Full knowledge of the strength and weaknesses as well as of the intentions of the enemy means a great advantage over him in any war. No well-advised government will fail to familiarize itself thoroughly with the literature, travel reports and research by its agents and neutral observers. Information gained from informers and spies is apt to supplement information from other sources. Frequently, insignificant reports, if the fragments are put together, offer a coherent picture and permit of correct conclusions about the enemy's intentions.

On the other hand, it is of supreme importance to make it difficult for the enemy to get information about one's own country. This requires not only a specially trained department, heavy penalties for enemy spies and for traitors; it is also necessary that the entire people, and particularly the press and radio, be educated to use extreme caution in giving out information which might enable the enemy to draw any kind of conclusions about the defenses of the country.

Shrewdness and cunning can be utilized to mislead the enemy. Just as the enemy may be led to make false moves because of seeming operations of one's defense forces, demonstrations or diversions, so he can be prevented from making correct decisions by false reports of a military, political or economic nature. Naturally, the misleading reports must not lack the semblance of probability, and they must be disseminated in the enemy country in an inconspicuous manner, and at the right moment.

Weltwoche, Zurich

How about a light, please?

What Britain Fights For

—A letter to The London Times *by St. John Ervine, British author and critic*

There are, it seems, strangely ignorant people who, though they know what we are fighting against, do not know what we are fighting for! They are akin to the incipient sadists who complain, bitterly and vociferously, that we are "doing nothing," by which misstatement they mean, apparently, that the number of the slain on all sides, but especially on ours, is still countable. Why are there not more dead bodies about?

If these people do not yet know what we are fighting for, they must have heads made of solid bone. The implication of their inquiry, however, is less innocent than it appears to be; they suggest that if they do not know what we are fighting for, we ought not to be fighting at all. Some of them, a year ago, were grossly abusing the Prime Minister because he was then striving, as no man in the history of the world has ever striven before, to avert the war, but today, appalled, perhaps, by the prospect of being themselves drawn into the slaughter for which they clamored so loudly, they crawl and creep about the country, trying to coo like sucking doves that once were screaming like carrion crows. "What are we fighting for? We know what we are fighting against, but what are we fighting for?"

If a demented man habitually disturbs the peace of the district in which he lives, and eventually begins to beat up and rob and even kill those who are weaker than he is, his neighbors who are able to resist his aggressions will try to put him under restraint. They certainly will not allow him to reduce them to his own level of lunacy, nor will they feel obliged to interrupt the process of restraining him to tell any person who happens to be looking on just what their plans for the future are

with respect to criminal law reform or the treatment of mental defectives. That can be explained or performed after he has been locked up and they have peace and time in which to consider their plans.

I should have thought that knowledge of what we are fighting against was a large part of the knowledge of what we are fighting for. We are fighting against the continual threat or performance of aggressive acts and the recurrence of periods of anxiety and distress. We are aware that in spite of extraordinary progress towards the establishment of the good life, we *still* have much uncultivated ground to till, and we are sick, sore, and tired of being diverted every four months from our attempts to cultivate it by the need to mobilize the cultivators and defend the ground already tilled.

We realize beyond a doubt that, until we have put this demented man under close restraint, we cannot move forward an inch, and may have to back a mile. We are fighting for the right to keep the civilization we have created, and the right to extend it and make it a better civilization. We are here highly resolved that any system of society which involves the persecution and robbery and murder of dissentients from the rules or opinions of the party in power is a wicked system and one which cannot be endured. Even if the disturber of the peace does no more than make an incessant row in his own backyard, we claim the right to restrain him on the ground that we can neither sleep nor work nor think because of his din.

When the people of Lystra tried to make gods of Barnabas and Paul, the apostles vehemently protested against their own deification, saying: "Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you," and they added to this protest a remark which is, I think, the plainest and most concise statement of what we are fighting for. God, they said, had "in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways." The Nazis, like their little brothers, the Communists, will not allow other nations to walk in any ways but theirs, and it is to prevent them from fulfilling their foul and felonious intent that we are fighting. We desire, and are determined to obtain, that state of existence in which "all nations" may "walk in their own ways."

VII. Democracy on the Defensive

(Continued from page 33)

ernment? I think it is principally because we have been conditioned through experience to think of education as something unpleasant, dull and slightly boring. This is hurdle number one for the adult educator. He must find ways of making education for good citizenship interesting and more compelling than other attractions demanding attention. There are only two important ways in which to attract and sustain the interest of most citizens in education. One is through a great teacher, and the other by means of a technique or "show" which excites the curiosity and interest of the listener. A man will work at a job he doesn't like in order to provide himself with the necessities of life. But he will not participate in processes of self-government if he finds that participation boring.

A real understanding of today's complexities is impossible for the great majority of people. We must therefore rely upon honest leadership. Democracy has already foundered on this rock in several countries. For our generation it is a fight for survival, but not necessarily a survival of the fittest. It will be the survival of those who can furnish the most effective leadership—the kind of leadership that will reach the masses of the people in terms that they can understand.

It is here that education has failed us. It has been my privilege to be a member of two university faculties, and I admit with a sense of profound regret that as soon as a teacher becomes what is generally characterized as popular—that is, when he develops a capacity to talk or write interestingly for a wide public—the envy of his colleagues expresses itself in a whispering campaign to discredit him. He is not scholarly. He is not dignified. He is too "popular."

We seem to have forgotten that the greatest teacher of all, two thousand years ago, used methods to get his message to the masses that would be characterized by today's academicians as pure showmanship. He wrought miracles and made predictions about the future life. He talked to the people in simple parables and told them stories of rare beauty. He did not rely upon logic or reason. He knew how to reach the hearts of men, and did.

You have often heard the Biblical quotation: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The full sentence reads—and you will find it in the eighth chapter of Saint John—"If ye follow my word, then ye shall be my disciples indeed: and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Quite a different meaning from the one generally quoted. The poet Goethe has shown us the futility of the search for truth via the rational process.

Men are not moved by appeals to reason, for instinctively they know that reason is too often the servant of the other man's will. Give any one of us control of our sources of information and communication, and if we wished, we could have this country at war in a week.

I hope it is clear that I am not advocating less use of the rational process. I am advocating, however, that we use all of our capacities: mind, body, and spirit, or, if you prefer, the will, rationality, and conscience.

In short we need to pattern our educational and religious leadership after the methods of the great teacher of Nazareth. In order to reach the warm heart of humanity we must be warm-hearted ourselves. We must be understanding and sympathetic with the problems of those less fortunate than ourselves. If we would advance the cause of justice we must be just ourselves in our dealings with our fellow men. If we would have peace and democracy, we must produce teachers who are great leaders, teachers who have the capacity of drawing out the best in human nature. We cannot stand on our dignity if we are going to save the most priceless treasures of advancing civilization—individual freedom and respect for human personality.

I do not know how far we in America shall go in the coming year or in the coming decade toward the achievement of our ideals, but I believe we shall go part way at least. We are custodians of civilization at this moment of history, and we must supply the leadership which will prevent our generation from being engulfed in another dark age. If we have the courage to face our perils honestly, I am sure we shall succeed.

Chronology of the European War

NOVEMBER 20—Six more ships are victims of the war at sea, three of them sunk by mines in the North Sea.
—From his haven in Switzerland, Fritz Thyssen, industrialist and early backer of Adolf Hitler, reveals that he has broken with the Nazis over the issue of the war.
—Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles reasserts the right of Americans to trade in China and American opposition to Japanese interference. He denies that Washington will protect Franco-British concessions in Chinese cities.

NOVEMBER 21—The 11,930-ton Japanese liner *Terukuni Maru* is sunk by a mine off the east coast of England.
—Britain announces that German exports will be seized in retaliation for indiscriminate mining of sea lanes. Germany denounces the British step as "piracy." Some neutral countries lodge protests with London.
—Arrangements are made in the United States whereby American exports will be certified by the British on this side of the Atlantic to facilitate their passage through blockaded waters.
—German police say the Munich beer hall bombing of November 8, directed at Hitler, was engineered by two British secret service agents, who have been arrested, and by Otto Strasser, an exiled former Nazi. It was carried out, they say, by a German who planted a time bomb in a pillar.
—The Argentine government blasts hopes of American traders by announcing a new import policy designed to limit purchases to Britain and France for the duration of the war.

NOVEMBER 22—The Netherlands cancels sailings as the French follow the British policy of confiscating German exports.
—The British destroyer *Gipsy* founders in shallow water after striking a mine.
—German secret police declare that for twenty-one days they had sent British agents "silly messages," supposedly from underground anti-Hitler groups.

NOVEMBER 23—British Admiralty declares it believes German seaplanes are parachuting magnetic mines into the sea lanes as nine more ships are sunk. Berlin insists Germany is observing the letter of international law in the laying of mines, holding that the British have made a war zone of all coastal waters.
—The Rumanian Cabinet resigns and a pro-French former Premier, George Tatarescu, is summoned to form a new cabinet.
—Japanese troops report the imminent capture of Nanning, in Southern China.

NOVEMBER 24—The British Admiralty admits that on November 21 the new 10,000 ton cruiser *Belfast* was damaged in the Firth of Forth.
—The arrest of two alleged British Intelligence Service agents near the Netherlands-German border in connection with the Munich bomb plot causes the Hague to ask for an explanation from Berlin.
—Japanese troops enter Nanning.

NOVEMBER 25—Germans planes bomb British warships in the North Sea. Berlin claims direct hits on four vessels, but London declares no damage was done.
—Germany denounces the use by Britain of disguised submarine hunters following the announcement that one such ship has been sunk by a U-boat.
—Tokyo threatens counter-measures against Britain if shipments of supplies from Germany to Japan are interrupted.

NOVEMBER 26—Moscow charges that Finnish artillery fired on Russian troops at the border, killing four. A note is handed to the Finnish Foreign Minister demanding that Finnish forces withdraw twelve and a half miles from the frontier. The newspaper *Pravda* assails Premier Cajander of Finland, calling him a "clown."
—Finland denies that her troops fired on the Russians and rejects the Soviet demand for withdrawal from the frontier.
—The $6,000,000 luxury liner *Pilsudski*, under charter by the British from Polish owners, is sunk by a torpedo or mine. The liner *Rawalpindi*, converted into a British warship, goes down with 283 men.
—Jean Monnet is chosen chairman of the Joint Committee established by London and Paris to co-ordinate allied economic affairs.

NOVEMBER 27—The Soviet radio calls upon the people of Finland to revolt and overthrow the government while anti-Finnish agitation in the Soviet press and at workers' meetings throughout Russia grows.
—London expresses to Moscow its hopes that the Russo-Finnish dispute can be settled peacefully. Berlin gives full moral support to Moscow's demands in Finland.
—War at sea claims five more ships. The British Admiralty makes the startling disclosure that the armed merchant cruiser *Rawalpindi* was sunk by the German pocket battleship *Deutschland* off the coast of Iceland.
—King George VI signs an Order in Council making German exports subject to seizure by the Allied navies. Secretary Hull says the United States is reserving all rights in connection with the export blockade.

NOVEMBER 28—Moscow, denouncing non-aggression pact with Finland, charges hostility against Russia by the Finns. Finnish troops are ordered to retire from the border to avoid provocation.
—Berlin announces that Lieutenant-Captain Guenther Prien, the hero of the sinking of the *Royal Oak*, has sunk a British cruiser of the *London* class. London dismisses the story as "devoid of truth."
—King George VI opens a new session of Parliament.

NOVEMBER 29—Moscow severs diplomatic relations with Finland. Premier Molotov declares, in a radio broadcast, that Finnish hostility had become "unbearable" and virtually demands that a new government be set up in Finland. Molotov indicates that Moscow will reject a tender of good offices by the United States.
—London welcomes an offer by Secretary of State Hull to mediate in the Russo-Finnish dispute. Italy expresses sympathy for the Finns and fear that Rumania will be the next to claim the attention of the Red Army.

NOVEMBER 30—At 9:15 A.M. troops of the Red Army invade Finland. Finnish cities bombed by Russian planes include Helsinki, Viborg and Hangoe.
—President Roosevelt appeals to Russia and Finland to refrain from bombing civilians and unfortified cities.
—Premier Daladier granted extension of his decree powers for the duration of the war.

DECEMBER 1—Premier Cajander resigns and Finland sets about forming a new government under Risto Ryti in the hope of securing an armistice with Russia. Russian bombers raid Helsinki, killing scores. In the far north the Red army battles its way into the port of Petsamo. On the Karelian Peninsula, Soviet forces push inland, and in the Gulf of Finland the Russian navy reports occupation of four strategic islands.
—Moscow announces the formation of a "People's Republic" in Finland and recognizes the new "democratic order," founded by Otto Kuusinen as President and Minister of Foreign Affairs in the insignificant village of Terijoki just within the Finnish frontier. Kuusinen, an exiled Finnish Communist, had long been a resident of Moscow.
—Norway and Sweden are stunned and indignant over the Soviet invasion of Finland but remain officially neutral.

DECEMBER 2—Finnish defenders hold off invading Red land and naval forces.
—A treaty of "mutual assistance and friendship" between the "government of the Democratic Republic of Finland" —a band of exiled Finnish Reds—and the Soviet Union is announced in Moscow.
—President Roosevelt announces a "moral embargo" against the Soviet and the sale of planes and munitions to Russia is cut off.

DECEMBER 3—The League of Nations is summoned to consider intervention in the undeclared Finnish-Russian war.
—Aided by a snowstorm which grounds Soviet bombers, Finnish forces hold back

the Russian drive. Land mines kill many Soviet troops.
—English bombers attack the German naval base at Helgoland, scoring hits on a cruiser and two destroyers, according to the British Air Ministry.
—Britain's two-way contraband patrol goes into effect as a reprisal for German mine-laying in ship channels.

DECEMBER 4——Finland's proposal for an armistice and peace negotiations is bluntly rejected by Moscow, which refuses to recognize the existence of Premier Ryti's government. Premier Molotov notifies the League of Nations that the Soviet will not attend the Council session convoked for December 9.
—Argentina sponsors a move to expel Russia from the League.
—A German raider, believed to be the battleship *Admiral Scheer*, sinks the 10,086 ton British refrigerator ship *Doric Star* in the South Atlantic.

DECEMBER 5—5 Russian tanks and mechanized forces attack Finnish defenders on the Karelian Isthmus, and suffer heavy losses.
—Sweden calls forty thousand men to the colors, mines the waters opposite the Aland Islands and presses for a coalition cabinet.
—Rome reports that many Italian fliers have gone to Finland to pilot Finnish planes.
—Foreign Secretary Halifax expresses Britain's disapproval of the Soviet's "inexcusable act of aggression."
—Former President Herbert Hoover announces that he will establish an organization to raise funds for the relief of Finnish non-combatants.

DECEMBER 6—The *Communist International*, official organ of the Comintern, calls for the immediate conclusion of a Soviet-Rumanian pact similar to those drawn up between Russia and the Baltic States now dominated by Moscow. The article says minorities in Bessarabia are suffering "unbearably" and intimates that the Soviet will "save them."
—In both the Swedish and Danish parliaments deputies show their opposition to the Soviet attack on Finland by walking out *en masse* when Communist members rise to defend it.
—London reveals Britain has agreed to ship war materials to the Finns.
—Berlin rails at the new allied blockade and a German expert writing in Goering's official magazine *Four-Year Plan* admits that Britain's action already has brought Germany's overseas trade to a standstill.

DECEMBER 7—Moscow announces that Finland will be blockaded and Finland reports Soviet naval units have already closed the Gulf of Finland.
—The Fascist Grand Council in Rome warns Russia that events in the Balkans are of direct interest to Italy. At the same time the Council reaffirms the Rome-Berlin axis.

DECEMBER 8—The Turkish press accuses German Ambassador von Papen of trying to embroil Turkey and Russia.
—German patrols stage more than eighty raids along the Western Front where the strengthening of the Maginot Line is said to have been completed.
—Finland reports that Russian forces, reinforced by 25,000 fresh troops, were repulsed in attempting to crack the Mannerheim Line on the Karelian Peninsula.
—An article in the *Communist International*, official organ of the Communist Party, ordering Rumania to conclude a mutual assistance pact with Russia, is disavowed by the Soviet government.
—The new British destroyer *Jersey* is damaged by a German submarine and three more British merchant ships are sunk. Britain claims the destruction of two, possibly three, U-boats.
—Nazi planes are driven off by anti-aircraft guns when they attempt to reach Paris.
—A note from Secretary of State Hull requests Britain to refrain from applying its German export blockade to American ships.
—Former President Herbert Hoover makes a nation-wide appeal for Finnish non-combatants and opens relief offices in New York.

DECEMBER 9—Tass, official Soviet news agency, repeats reports of German military aid to Finland.
—More frequent raids and stronger stands by German patrols on the Western front create speculation as to whether some new development can be expected in the war on land.

DECEMBER 10—Violent fighting in knee-deep snow on Finland's eastern frontier is reported. The Finns declare they have repulsed all Soviet attacks, although Moscow announces that the Red army has advanced several miles "in all directions."
—The United States takes its first material step to aid Finland by making credits of $10,000,000 available through the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with which Finland can buy agricultural surpluses and "other civilian supplies." The action immediately follows an appeal from Finland to the world for "active help."
—Berlin denies reports published in Moscow that Germany has extended aid to the Finns.

DECEMBER 11—The League of Nations asks Russia to submit her dispute with Finland for negotiation.
—Finland issues a White Book outlining the Soviet's pre-invasion demands, described as an attempt at military domination.
—With the announcement from London that four British ships have disappeared in the South Atlantic it is suggested that a German raider, possibly the *Admiral Scheer*, may be in that area.
—Sweden attempts to form a coalition cabinet omitting Foreign Minister Sandler, who has been under fire in the German press.

DECEMBER 12—Moscow rejects League of Nations demands that it negotiate with Finland. Striking hard at Finland's "waist," the Russians drive across the country at its narrowest point.
—The German luxury liner *Bremen* runs the British blockade and arrives safely in her home port of Bremerhaven after a dash from the Russian Arctic port of Murmansk.
—France and England announce a financial entente stabilizing their currencies until six months after peace is concluded and calling for the sharing of loans and credits.
—Berlin issues a White Book designed to show that Britain is responsible for the war and containing 482 documents to prove it.
—On the Western front the Germans launch a vigorous attack south of Saarbruecken but the Allies report holding their ground.
—Virginio Gayda, known as Mussolini's mouthpiece, declares in a radio address that Italy is bottled up in the Mediterranean and must have free egress through Gibraltar and Suez.

DECEMBER 13—The German pocket battleship *Graf Spee* steams into Montevideo Harbor shortly before midnight with thirty-six of its crew dead, following an all day battle off the Uruguayan coast with the British cruisers *Ajax*, *Achilles*, and *Exeter*. The *Exeter* was badly damaged and forced out of the fight.
—Hailing victory over the *Graf Spee*, London claims a naval success in the announcement that a submarine, which had failed to sink the luxury liner *Bremen*, had sunk a U-boat and torpedoed a German cruiser in the North Sea.
—The League of Nations committee condemns Russia as an aggressor and calls for aid to the Finns by members and non-members (the United States) and suggests expulsion of the Soviet from Geneva.
—The Finns report throwing the Russians back in a counter-offensive and are said to have carried the war onto Soviet soil.
—The House of Commons holds its first secret session and debates charges of Government bungling while in the House of Lords a plea for peace is called "unfortunate", by Foreign Secretary Halifax.

DECEMBER 14—The Uruguayan Government ignores British demands that the *Graf Spee* be compelled to leave Montevideo or be interned within twenty-four hours and decides to permit the crippled warship to remain until she repairs damages.
—The British mass a strong fleet out-

side the harbor of Montevideo to prevent the escape of the *Graf Spee*. The cruiser *Exeter* makes for an Argentine naval base after wiring ahead for 100 beds for her wounded.
—The British destroyer *Duchess* is sunk in a collision in the North Sea with a loss of 120 lives.
—The League of Nations Council and Assembly vote unanimously to drop Russia from the League, China and neighboring states refraining from voting in fear of retaliation. The attack on Finland continues and the Russians reach the Norwegian border in the Far North, but the Finns claim success in counter-attacks in Korelia.

DECEMBER 15—The Government of Uruguay decides that the *Graf Spee* must leave Montevideo within 24 hours or be interned. At the same time, the Government protests to Britain and Germany for fighting within Uruguayan waters, and sets up a joint patrol with the Argentine fleet to prevent a repetition of fighting if the *Spee* tries to get away.
—Secretary Hull is non-committal as to what action might be taken as consultations have begun among the pan-American nations in relation to the "safety belt" established around the Western Hemisphere.
—British fliers bomb three German seaplane bases while 8 more merchant ships are lost in the war at sea.
—Finland announces the capture of the strategically important town of Suomussalmi and the sinking of a Russian destroyer by shore batteries.
—While the League of Nation speeds plans for quick assistance to the Finns, Finnish Foreign Minister Vaino Tanner broadcast an appeal to Moscow for peace, urging Russia to accept wide concessions and at the same time warning that Finland is ready to defend herself to the last man.
—The Communist Party of the United States advises its members to stop boycotting German goods, declaring "this struggle (the World War) is an imperialist war, one in which the workers have no interest except to bring it to the speediest possible conclusion." The Communists continue the Japanese boycott calling the Sino-Japanese war "the struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese invaders is not an imperialist fight, but a just resistance."

DECEMBER 16—The *Graf Spee* rushes repairs and appeared to be getting ready to depart from Montevideo while the German Minister presses for an extension of the warship's stay. Rumors are current that German naval reinforcements are speeding to help the *Spee* escape a strong British and French naval trap.
—Hitler confers with the heads of Germany's armed forces and there are renewed charges that poison gas shells were used by the British boats.
—A German steamship is scuttled to avoid capture and three neutral ships and one British vessel are sunk in European waters.
—Foreign Minister Ciano defends all of Germany's actions in recent years and [illegible] with Moscow, in a sudden reaffirmation of the Rome-Berlin axis. He says Germany and Italy had agreed not to go to war for another three years but that England forced Berlin to sign the Moscow pact to prevent encirclement by the allies, and that England alone was to blame for the present hostilities.
—Moscow officially denies that the Soviet Union is at war with Finland and ridicules Russia's expulsion by the League of Nations.
—Finland claims smashing a heavy concentration of Russian forces on the Karelian Isthmus and reports the sinking of a Russian patrol ship. The Finns admit retreating in the North but say they have dug in to resist a strong Russian advance.
—The French repel a strong German attempt to seize outposts on the Rhine-Mozelle Front, while Paris discloses that France has ordered 650 more U. S. planes.

DECEMBER 17—The *Graf Spee*, on orders from Hitler, heads out to sea and then is blown up by a skeleton crew outside the harbor of Montevideo.
—The Finns continue to claim successes against the Russians and it is asserted that 20,000 Red soldiers are trapped and three 30,000 ton tanks are destroyed in Karelia.
—Moscow continues to score the League of Nations for her expulsion and accuses the United States of being the prime mover in the League's action.

DECEMBER 18—British and German planes clash in the biggest air battle of the war over Helgoland Bight. Berlin claimed thirty-four of forty-four British bombers were shot down. London said all but seven British planes returned to their base, and that twelve German planes were destroyed.
—The British Admiralty announced that British submarines had sunk a German cruiser, crippled two others, and destroyed a U-boat.
—London also announces that the first contingent of Canadian troops has made a successful crossing of the Atlantic and is on the way to training camps.
—Soviet troops report progress in the Finnish Arctic, employing modern mechanization against retreating Finnish soldiers.
—Officers and crew of the pocket battleship *Graf Spee* are interned by Argentina.

DECEMBER 19—German luxury liner *Columbus*, caught in British gunboat trap, is scuttled by its crew 450 miles east of Cape May, N. J. Survivors—nine women and 570 men—are taken aboard the United States cruiser *Tuscaloosa*.
—Air attacks are resumed by Russia. Bombs are dropped on Helsinki, Abo, Borga, Viborg, and Hangoe.
—United States Under-Secretary of State Sumner Wells denounces Russian invasion of Finland.

DECEMBER 20—Captain Hans Langsdorff of the *Graf Spee* commits suicide in Buenos Aires.
—United States extends "moral embargo" against wanton aggressors to include means of producing high-quality

I. The Future of Europe

(Continued from page 16)

This was never true or even plausible outside Russia until the sudden ripsnorting development of Stalinist imperialism from September to December, 1939, made it begin to seem quite plausible. By his new foreign policy, particularly the outrageous attack on Finland, Stalin has gone very far towards producing the very thing he has feared for so many years —a combination of Europe against Russia.

If there should be a change of government in Germany, which is the one clearly expressed objective of Great Britain in this war, it begins to seem possible, although scarcely more than possible, that a combination of the European states might evolve. Among the various schemes of federation now being discussed, there would no doubt be found one which would combine the alluring verbiage of democratic freedom and the military efficiency of an alliance against Russia. Stalin would then reap the full results of his new policy, and although it is obviously impossible for any combination of powers to effect a conquest of the whole Soviet Union, it is not at all impossible that the Hitler dream of a Germany enlarged towards the southeast might come to reality under other auspices and in another way.

Conversely, a pause in the present war—an armistice or truce, for peace seems altogether out of the question —might bring exactly the result the German military theorists and some of the Russians have had in mind for years: a full, true alliance between Germany and Russia, whereby the natural resources of the latter would be at the disposal of the technical and organizing genius of the Germans. In that case the war would be resumed on terms so desperately unfavorable to the two western powers that nothing except a full-powered intervention of the United States of America could save them from conquest and dismemberment.

These alternatives seem apocalyptic, so calamitous that they are automatically rejected by all right-thinking, jovial, optimistic people. I offer them not as belated cheery greetings for 1940, but as the suggestions which seem to me to arise from the present complexity and inherent nature of the contending forces. Not one war, but a series, seems to me to be in prospect, and this side of total ruin there is no one result which I would venture to expect with confidence. Revolutionary and ideological wars, like religious wars to which they are closely akin in nature, cannot come to quick conclusions. In history we have seen them last twenty, twenty-five, thirty years. There seems little reason to expect a more rapid termination in this case.

Non-Fiction in 1939

(Continued from page 5)

Wind, Sand and Stars

It is difficult to classify Antoine de St. Exupery's *Wind, Sand and Stars.* It has been called autobiography, philosophy, and adventure. Actually, it is a combination of all three. Its author is a French aviator who found new horizons of thought in the sky. He looked out from his plane and found new perspectives—of life as well as of land.

In a sense, then, *Wind, Sand and Stars* breaks new ground; it provides philosophy with a new dimension; it is a deep well of personal observations made possible only by the greatest revolution in transportation known to man. And yet, it is not surprising that such a book has not been written before. Aviation has existed but a brief moment in the scale of time. Other aviators have undoubtedly felt the same feelings as St. Exupery, but he is the first to give them expression.

X. Business and the Forties

(Continued from page 42)

pected to be a rout of prices into the most exciting rally in years.

Reports from the field of industry stated that executives, remembering the havoc wrought by over-expansion during the last conflict, did not plan to over-expand their plants to meet the war demands. The danger of unhealthy price rises nevertheless may still be present. On the other hand, large expansion of plants to accommodate the abnormal war demands would almost certainly leave an unhealthy condition with the advent of peace. In this case, unless the government steps in, the wisdom of the industrialists may inadvertently lead to inflation for the consumer.

However, we enter the Forties with an economy already semi-managed and far better able to cope with abnormalities than a decade ago. The internal condition of our economy is also far stronger. When the abnormal influences cease, we should be in a far healthier condition to resume our progress toward a higher standard of living per capita and more abundance.

Even without the vast stimulation of war in Europe, our economy was ready to go forward. This does not mean that all the diagnoses of our ills by the New Deal were completely wrong. The examination was penetrating. The change of tempo, the change of life of this great country, has become widely known. Indeed, it has probably been over-emphasized, so that we have been suffering from an over-dose of pessimism as in the late Twenties we suffered from an overdose of optimism.

We have passed through the dismal decade at last and gradually are adjusting ourselves to the great changes that have taken place. A new generation is growing up which does not demand a return to the old rules of the game. Things are wearing out and new inventions, not yet capitalized upon, are plentiful. The Sleeping Giants are awakening. A major movement of population, a deurbanization, made possible by the motor car, is ready to take place.

And on top of all this, we are confronted with a European War, which promises large draughts upon our raw materials and finished goods. If America looks to 1940 and to the Forties for a higher standard of living, that seems certain to come.

VIII. Our New Arms Program

(Continued from page 35)

heavy and light—the fire power of the reduced strength infantry has been increased.

In the Army Air Corps, the expansion program already authorized by Congress calls for augmenting the actual strength in all types of planes from 2,320 to approximately 5,500 by June, 1941. By 1944 the Navy will have 3,000 instead of the 1,500 planes of all types in service at the beginning of September.

Two additional mobile anti-aircraft artillery regiments are now in process of organization. There are 6 Army and 3 Naval widely scattered air-bases in construction.

For increasing the mobility of the new Army some 12,000 four-wheel drive trucks, which can negotiate almost any type of terrain, are being contracted for. To officer the new divisions and the corps, since no increase in Regular Army officer strength is authorized, strenuous efforts have had to be made; these will include early graduation of all present service school classes—exclusive of the Military Academy and the War College—and the utilization of young reserve officers in the combat branches if Congress will make funds available.

In the cavalry certain regimental organization changes are being made to increase fire power and flexibility of movement. Also, the 6th Cavalry is being converted into a new element, a corps reconnaissance regiment, consisting of a squadron of horses, furnished with sufficient motor transportation for the conveyance of men and animals and a mechanized squadron of fast-moving scout cars and a motorcycle troop.

The year 1940 should see the development of a trained, mobile combat-team, capable of carrying out the initial objectives of adequate national defense.

It should be borne in mind that this is not a spur-of-the-moment, make-shift, but the result of a long-continued General Staff study. To bring the skeleton as now laid down to full size, however, sufficient enlisted strength to fill the Executive proclamation quotas is necessary. Hence the activity of Army recruiters today. In no other country in the world does there exist such a wealth of potential man power.

There are still stumbling blocks, however. The first of these is still man power. We have reshuffled the deck, so to speak, and dealt out the cards of new divisional organizations to make up the army corps which is to be the nucleus of our mobile ground striking power. We have even been able to deal out a few additional cards to permit that corps to function after a fashion. However, granted that the 227,000 Regular Army strength be attained, we will still be short units of artillery, engineers, supply and technical troops essential to make it a perfect combat team.

The name of the second obstacle is materiel: the guns, the ammunition, the machines, the necessary modern equipment without which soldiers are but just so many men, and which this country still lacks in quantity.

For it must be remembered that from the end of the World War until 1933 practically no funds were allotted to the Army for modernization purposes. Only in the last few years, in fact, has the Congress been allocating funds in any appreciable amount. One cannot just buy these technical and non-commercial items off the shelf; one must arrange for their manufacture. At least another year must elapse before equipment now in feverish construction is received. But the 227,000 Regular Army and 235,-000 National Guard will then still lack its additional necessary equipment. Were these critical items to be contracted for *today*, they would not be in the hands of the troops until 1942. This 2 year time-lag in manufacture is all-important.

In view of our new approach to defense problems it is reasonable to ask how much of this new organization stems from the military lessons of the last three months abroad? The answer is—none, directly. It is quite true that elements of similar type have been employed in the European war. All nations have been coming to the triangular divisional formation in the last few years. As the struggle proceeds, doubtless we shall have opportunity to find out how these combat-teams work in actual warfare, how mechanization will affect the modern battlefield. As yet it is too early to come to any definite conclusion. Nothing so far occurring, however, has brought about any revision of the cardinal points in the art of war.

In conclusion, we see the United States entering 1940 with a definite program of military and naval training, construction and upkeep. This first step toward future preparedness measures—remembering that one does not pull armaments out of a hat like rabbits—will mean insurance against the covetousness of aggressors, whoever they may be.

Note: The opinions expressed herein and the conclusions drawn are those of an individual. They should not be construed as reflecting official War Department views.

IX. Thomas E. Dewey of New York

(Continued from page 39)

pects his own opinions and conclusions to be subjected to the same slashing criticism from his aides.

Dewey has not completely broken from his early interests. On occasions he and his wife may go to the piano and hunt among old books of music for duets. She plays and he sings. They smile as they note some slip of memory or some old vocal problem once mastered, now lost again. Their voices still show thorough musicianship.

These home concerts are usually saved for his summer vacations. Last summer he rented an old farm near Pawling, something less than a hundred miles north of New York City by motor, but a hundred years away for peace and solitude. He liked it so well he has now become its owner. It is an old farm, a real farm with big barns and silos, plowed fields, pastures, and tall, large trees.

When Dewey arrives from town, he dismisses the driver to his own vacation. From the house come running his wife and their two boys, Thomas Jr., 7, and John, 4. The boys reach him first with shouts and clamber over him.

As always, he has brought up an armload of books, most of them on economic subjects, especially on the hard riddles of agriculture. He has strong ideas in that field and he seeks to reinforce them as he always seeks to confirm or correct his theories in all things with all the evidence that can be found.

One part of what he has called his "social philosophy" should always be kept in mind as explaining and illuminating the high purposes of his career. His creed is that before there was government there was man, the individual depending for his livelihood, his family's safety and property on his own energies and theirs. Government arose later, in order that many families might unite and by surrendering little freedoms make the great freedoms safe. In time the governments themselves became the greatest danger to those individual rights, and civilized history has been one long battle to keep a man's own government or a hostile government from destroying his freedom.

Whether Dewey's campaign for the Presidency, launched a few weeks ago, will bring him the Republican nomination, whether he will become our next President—or President in the years to come—is a matter for the future to answer. What we do know is that he has captured the imagination of a nation, that in hardly more than a decade, in the words of the Dartmouth College citation, he has made himself "influential in turning the tide of public cynicism and reviving the ancient concept of justice as a flaming sword."

II. Military Strategy and Tactics

(Continued from page 18)

nut to crack. Assuming these obstacles all crossed, and the Swiss and French armies defeated, where would the Germans find themselves? In eastern France, far from industrial centers, and with the channel still open to bring help from England.

In the last war this country lived in a dream world in which the horrible reality of the war in Europe was kept from it. By the time returning soldiers could get home to tell about it in any numbers, it was over, and public opinion hurriedly buried reference to it lest it find something in the tale of which to be ashamed.

Now, in facing another war, let us face the truth, that this one is a result of blind refusal to recognize planned aggression, of hysterical hope that the nations of Europe would not go to war, and the childlike trust that when Hitler and Stalin threatened the world with attack they did not mean it. Let us not, in the name of the countless thousands who died as a result of our unpreparedness in the last war, again shriek that we will not be involved in this one, and, like so many ostriches, plunge our heads back into the sand.

FIFTY TRAVEL BARGAINS

CURRENT HISTORY'S Travel Department takes pleasure in describing briefly fifty travel bargains in the United States, which are being offered today. Minimum rates from New York are quoted and are, of course, subject to change. Send in the coupon below if you desire additional information on any one or more items. 'a' after the price means American plan; 'e' means European plan. This service is offered gratis for the readers of CURRENT HISTORY.

FLORIDA

MIAMI, MIAMI BEACH, CORAL GABLES. In this area are concentrated the most extensive winter recreational facilities in the world. Miami, important business center with scores of modern hotels, Miami Beach, across Biscayne Bay, Coral Gables, planned along Spanish lines and Hialeah with its magnificent race-track. Bathing, boating, fishing, golf .... $118. e

KEY WEST. Southernmost city of the United States. A West Indies background, only 90 miles from Havana. Tropical climate tempered by sea-swept breezes. (Transportation by rail to Miami only.) .... $156. a

FT. MYERS. Nearest to the Everglades country. Noted as the winter home of Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford. Bathing and golf and fishing. Excellent Royal Palms collection. .... $132. a

BOCA GRANDE and USEPPA ISLAND. Fashionable bathing and fishing resort (especially Tarpon.) .... $174. a

SARASOTA. Ideal Gulf Coast resort and famous as circus winter quarters. Ringling Brothers Museum of Art here. $144. a

TAMPA. One of the great cities of Florida and an important port. Background rich in historical lore yet offering every modern recreational provision. . ... $106. e

ST. PETERSBURG, ST. PETERSBURG BEACH. Perhaps the most popular tourist center in Florida, St. Petersburg is almost surrounded by water and abounds in white sand beaches. .... $111. e

TARPON SPRINGS. Best known as the center of the colorful Sponge exchange, this small city has an old world charm of its own. Delightful climate. .... $134. a

JACKSONVILLE. Florida's largest city, 20 miles from the ocean on St. John's River. .... $92. e

ST. AUGUSTINE. Oldest city in the United States, founded by Ponce De Leon, 1513. All year resort with unusual historical interests. .... $82. e

PALM BEACH. Exclusive and world renowned winter resort center, with its Everglades Club, modern shopping streets, imposing villas and magnificent hotels. Every recreational facility. .... $139. a

WEST PALM BEACH. Noted as Florida's Year Round Resort situated where the Gulf Stream swings closer to shore than at any other site on the Atlantic Coast. .... $135. a

FORT LAUDERDALE. Unique tropical wonderland with historical setting of Seminole Indian Wars. .... $176. a

HOLLYWOOD-BY-THE-SEA. One of Florida's newest resorts (founded 1921) planned as ideal sports and recreational center. .... $169. a

TALLAHASSEE. Capital of the State since 1823 and for a long time a cultural center of the Old South. A city of unusual charm to the visitor. .... $95. e

WINTER HAVEN. Citrus Capital of the world and the city of one hundred lakes. A modern Venice with its many canals. The Florida Cypress Gardens are nearby containing many rare plants .... $132. a

LAKE WALES. Located on the highest lands in the state and conveniently accessible to all parts of Florida. Noted especially for the Bok Singing Tower of 71 bells and the Mountain Lake Sanctuary $95. e

SOUTH

NEW ORLEANS. With its mild winter climate is one of America's most picturesque and interesting cities. The old French Quarter is a leading attraction and the Mardi Gras Carnival brings visitors from all parts of the United States. ..... $116. e

MOBILE. Alabama's great industrial and resort city on the Gulf. Splendid hotels and bathing facilities through the winter months. "Azalea" season the latter part of March. .... $98. e

BILOXI. One of Mississippi's first settlements, located on the Gulf, and now a fashionable resort. Noted center for shellfish industry. Many beautiful parks. $117. a

WIGWAM GUEST RANCH, Phoenix, Arizona. On a real cattle range of 17,000 acres. 50 miles of desert trails. Swimming pool and usual sports attractions. .. $234. a

CROSS TRIANGLE RANCH. Prescott, Arizona. An operating cattle ranch equipped with guest accomodations. Real ranch life with cow-country dances. Hunting, swimming. .... $200. a

THE VALLEY RANCH. Valley Ranch, New Mexico. Close to Santa Fe National Forest, an unspoiled wilderness. High altitude, fine trout fishing. .... $181. a

SMOKE TREE RANCH. Palm Springs, Cal. A desert ranch in Palm Canyon with ideal winter climate. Sun-bathing and swimming Schools for children .... $240. a

SUN VALLEY RANCH. Sun Valley, Idaho. More than a guest ranch, Sun Valley combines modern comfort with the atmosphere of the old west .... .. $202. e

MID-SOUTH

ATLANTIC CITY (N. J.). Playground of America with its extensive boardwalk, beach, and amusement programs. Choice of thirty modern hotels. .... $44. a

VIRGINIA BEACH (Va.). All year round favorite for lovers of outdoor sport. Excellent beach and access to many points of historic interest: Williamsburg, Jamestown, etc Reached by overnight steamer. .... $75. a

HOT SPRINGS (Va.). Operated by the Hot Springs Company, which controls 17,000 acres of densely wooded reservation abounding in wild game. .... $97. a

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS (West Va.). Foremost sports and social center of the Alleghenies. Polo, golf, tennis, riding, swimming, fishing Superb natural surroundings. .... $76. e

ASHEVILLE (N. C.). Located near the Great Smoky National Park in perhaps the most magnificent scenic area in the United States, east of the Rockies. .. $102. a

PINEHURST (N. C.). Fashionable resort of the long-leaf pine country Excellent for golf, riding, shooting and all outdoor sport. Special all-expense trip feature. .... $108. a

SAVANNAH (Ga.). Offering a real picture of life in the old South and easily accessible by express ship three times a week. Special all-expense plans. ...... $76. e

SEA ISLAND BEACH (Ga.). Off the coast of Georgia. Offers unexcelled bathing and outdoor sports. Accessible by steamship .... $123. a

SPAS

FRENCH LICK SPRINGS (Ind.). Noted for its salt springs and baths. Excellent for rest-cures. .... $132. a

HOT SPRINGS (Ark.). More than 70 thermal springs much frequented by invalids Modern hotels built around springs. 150,000 visitors annually. .... $111. e

SARATOGA SPRINGS (N. Y.). Some 160 mineral wells containing calcium, magnesium, iron, potassium, etc. Splendid facilities including Nauheim bath system .... $57. e

GUAYMAS (Gulf of California). Southern Pacific Railway's new resort development reached overnight from Tucson. Ideal dry climate at sea level. Finest game fishing. Hunting excellent. .... $230. a

PALM SPRINGS. Popular desert resort offering unusual health and sports facilities Warm in winter and tropical in background. Many nearby scenic attractions. .... $268. a

SAN DIEGO and CORONADO BEACH. San Diego with its world-renowned harbor is one of America's fastest growing resort cities. Opposite on a peninsula is Coronado Beach with its host of social celebrities. .... $210. e

PEBBLE BEACH. Near Del Monte and famed for its magnificent winter homes. Seaside golf course one of sportiest in the world. .... $252. a

LA JOLLA. Beautiful coast resort north of San Diego, with large winter population. All facilities for water and land sports. Excellent climate year round $242. a

SANTA BARBARA. A perfect Pacific Riviera retreat with a background of mountains. Besides usual sports facilities noted for the Spanish Mission founded in 1786. .... $242. a

DEL MONTE. With a climate that varies less than 10 degrees between summer and winter, 20,000 acres of private grounds including 5 fine golf courses and practically all sports facilities. .... $260. a

HAWAII. Best visited from Los Angeles by boat on a tour of 9 or more days; in the Islands, Honolulu, the chief resort, noted for its Waikiki Beach and surf bathing. Equable climate the year round. (Not including ocean transportation.) .. $129. a

EL PASO (Tex.). Great border city of the southwest and guardian of the Mexico frontier; unusual variety of up-to-date hotels offering conveniences for a long or short visit. Near world's largest caves at Carlsbad .... $162. e

CARLSBAD (N. Mex.). Over the line from Texas in an altitude of 3,000 feet with dry sunny climate. Near the world-famous Carlsbad Caverns, an eighth wonder of the world. .... $171. a

SANTA FE (N. Mex.). Year round tourist and resort center in the heart of the real Indian country. America's oldest capital, it is full of historic interest. Exceptionally high altitude. .... $191. a

TUCSON (Ariz.). Sunshine city of America, with altitude of 2,400 feet. Famous for its clear dry healthful atmosphere. .... $187. e

HOT SPRINGS (Ariz.). Noted not only as a winter resort, but abounding in health giving waters. Delightful setting for a winter spa. .... $234. a

---

TRAVEL EDITOR, CURRENT HISTORY, 420 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Please send me more information about ....

....

NAME ....

ADDRESS ....

JAN. 40.

V. Latin America and the War

(Continued from page 28)

world crisis, it was almost impossible to buy American dollars there. Our trade was stymied. Why? One year we would buy up the entire output of wool. The next, if wool was a fourth of a cent cheaper in Australia, we bought practically none from Uruguay. Thus one of Uruguay's major industries was repeatedly thrown into chaos. Uruguay preferred to make five-year barter deals with Germany and Italy, for they guaranteed definite long-term production rather than periodic anarchy.

It will be necessary for us to cooperate with Latin American republics—several have suggested it—to promote greater production of these strategic materials. If the Japanese could go into Brazil and in five years build up a vast cotton industry that can already put about two million bales on the market (we sold only about three million bales last year), surely American initiative is capable of advancing those Latin American industries essential to our national welfare.

A proper program should: (1) provide a sound basis for the permanent exchange of goods; (2) help diversify Latin American production; (3) if fairly carried out, improve the prosperity of southern countries, raise living standards, create a wider market; (4) help break world monopolies costing us hundreds of millions annually; (5) lessen our dependence upon Asia and Europe, hence also lessen our danger of war entanglements far from our shores; (6) by the production of strategic materials nearer at hand, vastly strengthen our national defense.

We have not begun to approximate the future possibilities of our relations with the other countries of the Western Hemisphere. We have the opportunity, if we care to take it, of helping to found a reciprocal system based on justice and fair play, mutual economic benefits, and international law free of aggression—a system that can survive and serve as a future inspiration to a world badly in need of a successful program.

VI. American Politics in High Gear

(Continued from page 30)

Franklin Roosevelt, on occasions, has seemed to have. The President who comes next will have many troubles —continued deficits, large-scale unemployment, and, if he endeavors to care for the pocket, much sickness at heart because retrenchment will cause distress to many. If he knows the classics he may ponder on mythological stories. He may think of Pandora's box and derive what comfort he can from the fact that, after the evils had escaped, hope was still left.

Through the shadow that the war and the economic future casts on the political outlook in the United States there gleams one bright ray. A consequence of the war has been to weaken and almost destroy the effectiveness of those on the extremes of the Right and the Left who have been arguing for "isms" whose acceptance would mean an abandonment of the democratic way of life. The *Bund* ought to be done for, and it is unfortunate that all of its discredit did not come from disgust for National Socialism and its work but was added to or at least accelerated by the financial irregularities and ridiculous love affairs of Hitler's American agent.

On the extreme of the Left, many of those who were "fellow-travellers" during the time that Russia pretended support for an anti-Fascist democratic bloc have been seeking the road to Damascus in order to see a new light. They began to run when the Russo-German pacts were announced, and the retreat became a rout when Russia made war on Finland.

Fascist and Communist threats in the United States are, I think, much less menacing than some months ago. The country is more acutely aware of what remains of the threats. And at the same time, the Supreme Court of the United States seems genuinely concerned for genuine civil liberties.

Printed in the U.S.A.

It seems incredible that such beautiful books can be sold for only $1.69 *each*

Continued from other side

10,000 people are eager to accept, keep, and pay for the volume they receive each month! Exceedingly expensive and wasteful "left-overs" are thus eliminated. And contemporary authors, because of this large sale, willingly accept a lower royalty.

Undoubtedly, however, the principal reason members receive such excellent values is this: Forty-nine leading publishers co-operated by permitting the Club to use for *its* editions the *identical* plates used in printing the original and more expensive editions. Thus the Club is saved the greatest single expense in publishing, and this saving is passed on to its members!

Do not confuse this Club with those selecting, for the most part, new novels. Briefly, its object is to take the great books of the world and to publish them in sumptuous new *De Luxe Editions*. And then to extend, *to its own members*, the privilege of purchasing them at $1.69—less than the cost of the average novel!

FREE TO NEW MEMBERS—
H. G. Wells' *The Science of Life*

It is difficult for you to appreciate now how you may receive such outstanding examples of craftsmanship for only $1.69 each. To enable you to experience this surprise for yourself, the great 1536-page, one-volume edition of H. G. Wells' *The Science of Life* (as described below) is, for a limited time, being offered entirely free to new members!

YOU NEED SEND NO MONEY with the special postcard below. As soon as it is received by us, your gift copy of *The Science of Life* will be sent to you. With it will come the current month's selection and your first issue of the Folio—a monthly magazine sent free, exclusively to members. Each month it gives you interesting facts about the current selection, and previews the *coming* month's selection as well. Thus you always know in advance what the next book will be.

We believe that this Club assures you of more worthwhile books at greater savings than you ever thought possible . . . that it really gives you more for your book investment and reading hours than any other! To judge the truth of this for yourself, send this special postcard. No stamp is required. Mail the card at once, while this gift offer of *The Science of Life* is still open.

THE DE LUXE EDITIONS CLUB

Dept. C.H. 1 111 Eighth Avenue, New York City

Free...
NOW AS A MEMBERSHIP GIFT

The SCIENCE of LIFE

THE STORY OF ALL THINGS LIVING

By H. G. Wells • Julian Huxley • G. P. Wells

ONLY once in a generation does an epoch-making work like this appear! Here, in 1536 pages, over 600,000 words of text, and 340 fascinating illustrations, is unfolded the mighty epic of life on earth—a dramatic panorama of the universe's greatest mystery, from the earliest amoeba down to modern man and his civilization.

Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes said, "Of greater value than the whole four years of conventional college education would be a course based on this colossal work." For here are all the sciences, presented not as "ologies", but as living, breathless adventures, by H. G. Wells, the greatest modern "humanizer of knowledge". And Wells was assisted in the 5-year task of preparing this volume by his son, a noted physiologist, and Julian Huxley, world-famous biologist.

The Science of Life was originally published in 4 volumes, priced at $12.00. This richly-bound one-volume edition, printed from the *identical* plates, is yours as a *free gift*, when you mail the postcard.

THE DE LUXE EDITIONS CLUB [Dept. CH 1] 111 Eighth Ave., N.Y.

I wish to join The De Luxe Editions Club. In consideration of my enrollment at this time, you are to send me at once, absolutely free, my gift copy of *The Science of Life*, by H. G. Wells, Julian Huxley and G. P. Wells.

My membership will bring to me each month for an entire year the Club's De Luxe Selection—a book that formerly sold for $5.00, $10.00, or even more—but which I agree to purchase for only $1.69 plus the few cents postage.

You are also to send me each month the members' exclusive publication, THE FOLIO, which reviews the current and forthcoming selections.

Name . . . .

Address . . . .

City . . . . *State* . . . .

It seems *incredible* that such beautiful books can be sold for only $1.69 *each*

IT IS natural for you to think it an exaggeration when you read that, for only $1.69, you may obtain beautiful new De Luxe editions of books which formerly sold for $5, $10, and even up to $25 each! Yet this is a *fact* . . . and a pleasant one for the 10,000 members of the De Luxe Editions Club, who have banded together to make such values possible, for you as well as for themselves.

What *are* these books? How are they bound? Who illustrated them? What were their former prices?

"Books for a Lifetime"

These are "books for a lifetime" you would want in your permanent library . . . great works of Biography, Music, Travel, Art, History, Fiction, Science! Here are a few, together with former prices: Seven Pillars of Wisdom, $5; Moby Dick, $5; The Decameron, $17.50 in two volumes; The Travels of Marco Polo, $5; The Arts, by Hendrik van Loon; Chaucer's Canterbury Tales; Balzac's Droll Stories, $25 in two volumes; The Favorite Works of Mark Twain; Stories of the Great Operas, $10.50 in three volumes; The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam; Mr. Currier and Mr. Ives, $5; and The Complete Sherlock Holmes.

Each volume is unabridged and handsomely bound, many of the bindings being stamped with all the beauty and brilliance of genuine gold. Most of them contain 500 to 1000 pages, and some have specially designed slipcases. Among the famous artists who provided their drawings and paintings (many in full color) are: Rockwell Kent, Gordon Grant, Edmund Dulac, Ralph Barton, Everett Shinn, and Jean de Bosschère.

"Incredible"—Yet Here Is Why It Is True

If *you* were a publisher you would realize what it means to *know* that

(Continued on other side)

The SCIENCE of LIFE

By H. G. WELLS, JULIAN HUXLEY, and G. P. WELLS

See Other Side

No stamp is required on this postcard. Fill it out on the other side and mail it at once.

. George Gallup Louis Stark George V. Denny

llan Nevins William H. Chamberlin Frank E. Hill 25¢

CURRENT HISTORY

WENDELL WILLKIE

TOWN HALL ESSAY CONTEST

Youth Division Winner: FRANK W. KERR

Also ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ GORDON HAMILTON

"YOU'RE TELLING ME!"

"That's a funny one. You're telling me what a great thing the telephone is. As if I didn't know!

"Why, I'm one of the main reasons there's a telephone in our house. For you can bet your life I keep the folks pretty busy around here.

"Just think! If we didn't have a telephone, we couldn't order things in a hurry from the stores. And Grandma couldn't call up to ask if I had a tooth. And Daddy couldn't talk to us when he's out of town. And Mother would be tied down just something awful.

"And suppose one of us suddenly took sick? Or there was a fire? Or a robber, maybe? Well, I don't worry about those things when I see the telephone.

"Doesn't cost much either, my Daddy says. And Mother says, 'I don't know what I'd do without it.' "

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The World Today in Books

NORMAN COUSINS

LONG, long before the question arose over a third term for President Roosevelt, Jimmy Walker, publicity-studded mayor of New York City during its orchid era, was asked whether a public official should be allowed to succeed himself indefinitely. His answer, as I recall it, was that in politics, as in horse races, you always pick the most likely winner. "What the other horses may think or say about your horse shouldn't concern you in the least; and just because your horse happens to have won in all his previous starts is no reason to stop running him. The First Commandment for political parties is to run the man who can win."

I was reminded of this Walkerism in reading a chapter on the third term issue in Jay Franklin's new book, *1940* (Viking, $2.75). It seems clear here that the Democratic Party may be guided by this "First Commandment" and ask the President to succeed himself. For there is no other political figure, says Mr. Franklin, who can attract as much support or whose election would be as certain. And this may be the determining factor in Mr. Roosevelt's re-nomination —all talk over precedent and tradition notwithstanding.

Jay Franklin is a newspaper columnist who strongly supports President Roosevelt and the New Deal. He is closer to the White House perhaps than any of the other newspaper men. He is said to be the author of or collaborator on a not inconsiderable quantity of New Deal legislation. And what he says about the third term question may well offer the strongest evidence yet put forward that the President may accept renomination.

Up through 1938, he writes, Mr. Roosevelt was opposed to a third term. Aside from the fact that no other President had served more than twice, he was reluctant to seek a third term because he felt that any party which must depend on one man for victory was so weak as to be dangerous to the public welfare. But he felt, adds Mr. Franklin, that a combination of circumstances might arise which would cause him to change his mind—the circumstances of a foreign war or a domestic crisis "which might force him to remain in office in order to insure national unity."

Mr. Franklin does not say directly —now that the war has come—that the President has decided to seek re-election. The intimation is strong, however, that he may do so. At any rate, Jay Franklin is certain that the President has "reasonable assurance that he could be painlessly renominated and re-elected or name his own successor." Moreover, it is "Roosevelt or ruin for the Democratic Party." Mr. Franklin is convinced that, unless the President is re-elected, there might be a frustration of his reforms which would lead to "dangerous popular disillusion and to national despair on a scale which would render America almost helpless to resist the foreign pressures which have arisen to challenge our power and our institutions."

And what about the third-term tradition? As for Jay Franklin, it is a tradition only in the eyes of the President's opponents. Actually, he says, the tradition was invented to block a third term for General Grant —"it is one of the infantile bugbears of our national life. The Third Term Taboo is only a lamp which should have been puffed out long ago, just to show that we could do it. The common sense of politics is to keep a good man as long as he is useful and to get rid of a bad President as soon as his incapacity is evident. The process of impeachment should be used more freely to dismiss executives who have lost the confidence of the nation, and similarly the Third Term Taboo should be dynamited to make it pos-

He Set a Trap for Lightning

STALKING thunderstorms is nothing unusual for Karl McEachron. He's done it for years—photographing lightning bolts, studying struck trees and buildings, enticing lightning to strike his equipment and write a record of its voltage and power. He even has in his laboratory a machine to imitate it—a 10-million-volt lightning generator like the one seen last year by two and a half million visitors to the G-E building at the New York World's Fair.

Dr. McEachron's work has won him world recognition as an authority on lightning. And at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in the G-E High Voltage Laboratory, he and his associates are learning how to outwit this "outlaw" of nature—how to keep it from interfering with your electric service. That's one reason why a thunderstorm isn't the signal for a "black-out" in your home, as it used to be. Your lights may blink, but they seldom stay out.

Karl McEachron is one of the hundreds of men in General Electric who are devoting their lives to making electricity more useful to you—are helping industry to improve its products, to sell them for less, and so make them available to more millions of people. These men are helping to raise the living standards of everyone by creating "More Goods for More People at Less Cost."

G-E research and engineering have saved the public from ten to one hundred dollars for every dollar they have earned for General Electric

90-190C

sible for us to keep a Roosevelt for three, four, or five terms, while getting rid of a Harding or a Hoover after a couple of years at most."

Mr. Franklin's book does not consist solely of a discussion on the third term. I have emphasized this portion of his book because it is possible that what Mr. Franklin says may be something of a trial balloon. If anyone in Washington outside the White House knows what the President may do, it is probably Mr. Franklin.

As a whole, *1940* is a review of the New Deal and a statement of principles and practices for its continuation. Mr. Franklin, as in his newspaper columns, stresses the *new* in the New Deal. He is a collectivist who feels he has found the solution to the riddle which mankind has never been quite able to solve—the problem of obtaining maximum social benefits of a government with a minimum of abuses or political tyranny. Yet his supporting evidence is not too strong. In fact, there is some evidence to indicate that certain of his reforms might lead to things which Mr. Franklin himself, as an honest, thorough-going Democrat, might find completely distasteful. He is in favor, for example, of solving the unemployment problem of youth through a universal draft of all able-bodied young men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five, without exception, for national service on an economic, social, and military defense program.

One wonders, though, when national conscription of labor comes, whether labor camps can be far behind. The government which would have power to put these men to work on a compulsory basis might not decide to pass up the power to keep those men at work—long after the original age limit of twenty-five.

Perhaps the main fault with Mr. Franklin's book is that he has attempted not only to state the problem but also to offer a point-by-point solution. It all sounds a little too easy—almost a little glib. Possibly if he hadn't attempted to cover so much ground—economics, political philosophy, government—he could have written a much more effective book.

What this department is preaching is not agnosticism but a clearer statement of the problem itself. In government, as in medicine, there is no cure-all. What we can expect—and this is half the battle won—is a sound and accurate diagnosis.

February **CURRENT HISTORY** 1940

GENERAL ARTICLES

The National Pocketbook . . . . *Allan Nevins* 13

Asia Draws Its Sword . . . . . *William Henry Chamberlin* 17

Wendell Willkie of C. & S. . . . . *Gordon Hamilton* 21

Polling Public Opinion . . . . *Dr. George Gallup* 23

Monarchy and the German Army . . . *Robert Strausz-Hupé* 27

N.L.R.B. on the Carpet . . . . *Louis Stark* 30

Democracy Rules the Airwaves . . . . . *Frank Ernest Hill* 33

Uncle Sam Counts Noses . . . . *George F. Willison* 36

HISTORY IN THE MAKING 6

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? 39

Town Hall Essay Contest 43

THEY SAY 44

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS 53

CHRONOLOGY 55

TRAVEL 61

BOOKS . . . . *Norman Cousins* 1

COVER PHOTOGRAPHY BY PICTURES, INC.
BACKGROUND COURTESY WESTINGHOUSE

• ○ •

Editors: JOHN T. HACKETT, E. TREVOR HILL
Associate Editors: NORMAN COUSINS, ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ
Advertising Manager: JOHN A. CURTIS
Circulation Manager: FRED ROSEN
Editorial Assistants: LOIS HALL, NATHALIE OSBORN

Current History, Volume LI, No 6, February, 1940 Whole No. 303 Published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation Publication office, 29 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass.; editorial office, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N Y, E. Trevor Hill, President, John T. Hackett, Vice-President; Anne Roane, Secretary; I. Harvey Williams, Treasurer, John A. Curtis, Advertising Manager. 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Canada, Central and South America and Spain; elsewhere $1 25 a year additional. Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned. Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1939 at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879 Entered in Canada as second-class matter. Copyright, 1940, by C-H Publishing Corporation. Printed in U. S A.

THE evidence which has been accumulating in books such as Emil Lengyel's *The Danube* and M. W. Fodor's *Plot and Counter-Plot in Central Europe* in support of a Danubian Federation as a foundation for a lasting European peace receives fresh impetus in Stoyan Pribichivich's *World Without End* (Reynal and Hitchcock, $3.50). Mr. Pribichivich, after writing a sensitive, sympathetic story of the peoples and politics of Central Europe and the Balkans, is convinced that such a federation might be the first step toward a new League of Nations which would profit by the mistakes of the old: isolation of small nations, dominance of a few powers, failure to make its machinery operative.

What about the position of the small nations themselves toward a Danubian Federation which might become part of a new League? Hard experience, says Mr. Pribichivich, is teaching them that their future safety lies neither in "isolation nor in alliances with great powers, but in union with each other . . ."

Mr. Pribichivich refers to these small nations as a "world without end" because he feels that a free Southeastern Europe will remain a "tiny universe by itself, differing from the European West and from the European East, and yet harmoniously connecting them both."

At the moment, however, this "world without end" is repeating its tragic role in history. Although in the past 150 years there have been only two wars between the Balkan nations themselves, each lasting a few weeks, the Balkans have served as the battle-ground or the spoils of six wars among the great powers. For the Balkans are more the victims of geography than they are of their own problems; they lie squarely in the pathway of the continental route between Europe and Asia. And every power which dreamt of a continental empire, points out Mr. Pribichivich, attempted to dominate this route. "It has been and will continue to be a magnet for foreign imperialists and the battlefield of their conflicting expansions."

What Mr. Pribichivich has done is to clarify and explain the complicated story of the nations of Central Europe and the Balkans; to touch upon their history and the history of their peoples; to describe their leading personalities, past and present, political and non-political. It is a full-bodied, sensitively-written book. It is not the book of a journalist as much as the book of a person who himself was born and brought up in Southeastern Europe and who can write about its folkways, its traditions, its personalities with color and understanding.

WAR IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, edited by Willard Waller (Random House, $3.00), is an enterprising, provocative effort by twelve writers to define and analyze the causes and the effects of war, with particular emphasis on the social and economic factors involved.

The contributors to this symposium do not moralize, nor do they, even by implication, prescribe a cure-all for the chronic war malady. In fact, pessimism is the least common denominator of their combined diagnoses. It is a sober, realistic pessimism which fears that unless there is a scientific orientation—or rather re-orientation—of the economic and social factors that combine to make war, the collapse of civilization may be not only tragic but tragically near.

It seems entirely possible from this volume that the world is caught in the grip of historical dynamite from which there is no escape. At one time—perhaps not more than seventy-five years ago—the historian could separate civilizations into geographical units, declaring that even if one or more of the units collapsed there would still be others to carry on. He could point, for example, to the period in history when Europe was in decay at the same time that Chinese civilization was in full flower. But war today is more universal than ever before in history; the world has shrunk not only for transportation and communication but for destructive forces as well.

The volume is edited by Willard Waller, associate professor of psychology at Barnard College, and former president of the Eastern Sociological Society. The authors and titles of their contributions include Harry Elmer Barnes ("The World War of 1914-18"); Quincy Howe ("How the World War of 1939 Began"); Frances Winwar ("The World War and the Arts"); Max Lerner ("The State in Wartime"); Lamar Middleton ("Treaty Diplomacy Since the First World War"); Ralph D. Casey ("Propaganda and Public Opinion"); and Benjamin Higgins ("The Economic War Since 1918").

©TDW

EXPERIENCE, adventure, and travel await the eligible young men who choose the military profession as a career. The United States Army now affords unusual opportunities for technical and vocational training, athletics, and travel both in the United States and in Hawaii, the Philippines, Panama, Puerto Rico, and Alaska.

Call at the nearest U. S. Army recruiting station for an interesting folder *"Soldier's Life"*, or write to Dept. 24, R.P.B., U. S. Army, Governors Island, N. Y. U. S. Army recruiting stations are located in the Post Office Building of most towns and cities.

You Can Learn to be an Air Corps mechanic in the U. S. Army

Medical Department trains soldiers to be laboratory technicians

Enlisted Men of the Engineers may become competent surveyors

Signal Corps Soldiers learn to be radio operators and repairmen

NATIONAL DEFENSE WEEK—FEBRUARY 12-22

THIS SPACE CONTRIBUTED BY "CURRENT HISTORY" IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Politics in the Air

We are in for an old-fashioned political campaign, as the public will soon realize. New Hampshire's primary falls in March; earlier dates may be named in the South. The battle for votes is on. In 1936, 45,646,817 Americans went to the polls. Roosevelt got 27,476,673; Landon 16,679,583. In 1940 the Republicans are determined to change the score.

The candidates, whatever they mean to do later, are not following the advice "Nick" Biddle gave to General Harrison a hundred years ago. Let the General say—advised the shrewd Mr. Biddle—"not one single word about his principles, or his creed—let him say nothing—promise nothing. Let no committee, no convention, no town meeting ever extract from him a single word about what he thinks now or will do hereafter." This year's candidates are talking.

Much of this talk must remain academic until the White House speaks. Will F. D. R. run again? Will he consent, if the Democrats, in convention assembled, insist on nominating him? That is the question. According to political experts—men who have been following campaigns for a generation—anybody who can tell stories like the ones the President told at the recent Jackson Day dinner can't be beaten.

In the Republican ranks, experts say, the people seem to be turning to Dewey and the politicians turning away from him, but without completely showing their backs. Many Republican business men do not care particularly who is nominated so long as he is a big enough vote-getter to defeat Roosevelt, if Roosevelt it is. And Mr. Dewey's backers, with polite apologies to Senators Vandenberg and Taft, believe that only one Republican can do that. Needless to say, the backers of Messrs. Vandenberg, Taft and other Republican hopefuls disagree.

Judge Lynch

Philosophers and historians have long searched for an answer to the question: Is man becoming more civilized, more humane, more human? In October, 1854, the great German historian, Leopold von Ranke, who seemed to know the answer to everything, was asked by King Maximilian II of Bavaria: "Can one assume that today there are more better-behaved people than in earlier times?" "No," replied Ranke, "there has been no progress in morality. But there has been progress in humaneness: that is, people get drunk less than they used to; they don't beat each other up as much as they used to."

Statistics on lynchings in this country, released by the Commission on Interracial Cooperation in Atlanta and Tuskegee Institute of Alabama, give some point to what Ranke said. Since 1882, as far back as the records go, there have been 4,689 lynchings in the United States. Of these, 3,408 victims were Negroes. The peak year for lynchings was 1892, with 231. Since then, despite some ups, the trend has been steadily downward. In 1937 there were eight lynchings, in 1938 six, and last year, three, the lowest number on record.

Anti-lynching legislation in Washington has always been a political football, and multitudinous indeed are the words devoted to it in Congressional debates. The House passes anti-lynching legislation; Southern Senators, through filibustering and other tactics, manage to pigeonhole it. That happened in 1937 and is likely to happen this year also.

Southerners in Congress usually claim that the best way to stir up racial antagonism in the South is for Northerners to try to push through a statute against lynching. The way to eradicate the crime, they say, is to foster public sentiment against lynching below the Mason-Dixon line. Statistics seem to prove they are succeeding.

67 to 61 to 51

It used to be the "Nine Old Men." It may become the "Nine Young Men." The average age of the justices of the Supreme Court was sixty-seven in 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt became President. Today it is sixty-one, and the average age of the five Roosevelt appointees, now a majority of the Court, is fifty-one.

The years accomplish strange things. In 1933 the President and Congress were "liberal"; the Court was "conservative." Next year we may be talking about the "conservative" executive and legislative branches and the "liberal" judicial branch.

Names tell the story. In 1933, associated with Chief Justice Hughes, were Willis van Devanter, James C.

McReynolds, Louis D. Brandeis, George Sutherland, Pierce Butler, Harlan F. Stone, Owen J. Roberts and Benjamin N. Cardozo. Through retirement or death, Justices Van Devanter, Sutherland, Brandeis, Cardozo and Butler no longer sit in the marble palace near the Capitol. In their places are Hugh L. Black, Stanley F. Reed, Felix Frankfurter, William O. Douglas and now Frank Murphy. Sidelight: not a few observers think that Mr. Justice Douglas might be in the running at the Democratic convention if Mr. Roosevelt is definitely out.

The Ramparts We Watch

Election year or no, the chief aim of the country at the present time is to keep out of the European war. The President and his advisers are spending hour after hour discussing the European problems. They are trying to find a road over which Europe might travel toward peace. They are also trying to picture the kind of Europe that ought to be established when peace comes. As the President indicated in his annual message to Congress early in January, this country has a selfish interest in peace.

But he did not stop there. If the world cannot attain peace, he said, "We must be prepared to take care of ourselves." Plans for the expansion of the navy and army indicate that we ought to be able to do a pretty good job of it.

Figures may be monotonous, but they alone give an idea of the tremendous growth of our armed forces. In 1933, the budget for the army and navy was somewhere around $640,000,000. The combined budgets for defense in 1940 and 1941 are almost $4,000,000,000, or approximately $2,000,000,000 each year. If we take the expenditures since 1933 and those planned for 1940 and 1941 we get a national defense bill of almost $10,000,000,000.

Our strategic position makes our navy of first importance. This year the navy will cost about $1,100,000,000 and in 1941 about $1,135,000,000. These expenditures do not cover the 25 per cent increase in our naval strength which is now being proposed in Washington.

At the present time this is the way we stack up against the major naval powers. The tonnage figures are for ships built, building and appropriated for:

Britain	2,005,000 tons
United States	1,754,000 "
Japan	1,150,000 "
France	800,000 "
Italy	710,000 "
Germany	520,000 "

Hitherto we have had no well-defined naval policy. In general, we have trusted to the British navy to protect the Atlantic (and the Monroe Doctrine), while we took care of the Pacific. The war and the possible, though not probable, defeat of the Allies, have turned our strategists to the problem of what we must do to anticipate such an outcome.

Fitzpatrick—St. Louis Post-Dispatch
In the political submarine zone.

Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, believes we must have the 25 per cent increase to take care of a possible hostile combination of powers. He does not mention names, but Washington has Germany, Russia, Japan and Italy in mind. Such an increase, some naval experts say, would enable us to protect our Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, Hawaii, the approaches to the Panama Canal and perhaps our Atlantic trade routes. But, the experts add, it would not be sufficient to protect all South America, our trade routes the world over and the Philippines.

There are many critics of the program. Some go so far as to say that the President is pushing national defense and war problems to the fore to take the nation's mind off domestic matters. Others feel our present naval program is broad enough to secure the safety of the country. At any rate, Congress has no more important decision to make than that regarding the problem of defense.

Success Story

Pennsylvania Station, corner of 34th Street and Seventh Avenue, in the heart of New York's garment district, is one of the gateways of America. Here thousands of people rush in and out daily on their way to and from work, on their way to Florida and California. Here, recently, New Yorkers showed that they are a sentimental people, a people with a heart. For Penn Station had become a cathedral of song.

During the Christmas holidays the Pennsylvania Railroad installed an organ in the station and engaged Banks Kennedy as organist. A few days before Christmas he played "Silent Night," and the crowd that had gathered joined in song. A strong, resonant tenor somewhere down front rang through the station. Mr. Kennedy invited the tenor to the platform to try a solo. He did, and day after day he climbed to the platform to the wonder of all those who beheld.

Bankers, showgirls, housewives, salesmen—all stopped to hear, and to miss their trains. The tenor was Parker Watkins, an unemployed Negro. Native of Atlanta, former errand boy, college football player, worker on a tobacco farm, student of voice, WPA worker and unemployed again, Parker Watkins made good at Penn Station. Now he has been signed up by a leading concert manager, and the crowds may come to pay and hear where they only heard before.

Trade Fight

In December, 1791, Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton presented his voluminous Report on Manufactures. He argued for promotion of American business under the shelter of tariffs and bounties, and in doing so started a discussion that even now stirs the hearts of his countrymen.

In 1832 the tariff raised a revolt of the South Carolina planters. By that time the iron makers of Connecticut, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, the wool, hemp and flax growers of Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee, having made profits under the pro-

New York Times
Gone with the Wind

tection of the tariff wall, had become ardent protectionists. For a century the tariff had its ups and downs, but by 1930 it was high up. The Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 pushed duties to the highest point they have ever been in our history.

The Roosevelt Administration determined to make a change, but it realized that general revision of the tariff would be a task beyond Hercules. A way around the barrier was found. In 1934 the Trade Agreements Act was passed. The purpose of the law was to "expand foreign markets" and to remove tariff questions from the sphere of local pressure groups. Under it the President is empowered to negotiate trade agreements with foreign States. No agreement may raise or lower existing duties by more than 50 per cent; no dutiable article may be placed on the free list. The agreements—and this feature has been a target for many Senators—do not need the approval of the upper house of Congress as do regular treaties.

Twenty-two agreements have been signed since passage of the law. That with Czecho-Slovakia was dropped in April, 1939, after Hitler conquered Prague. The twenty-one in force include those with Cuba, Brazil, Sweden, the Netherlands, Switzerland, France and her colonies, Finland, the United Kingdom (with Newfoundland, the self-governing colonies and certain protectorates), Canada, Turkey and Venezuela.

Today the Trade Agreements Act is the center of controversy in Congress. The act will expire June 12th. The President and Secretary Hull, champion of reciprocal trade pacts, want an extension; many members of Congress, including Senator Vandenberg, one of the outstanding candidates for the Republican nomination, are opposed. Important foreign trade and other interests believe the act should be continued; other important interests, manufacturing, farm and labor, want to kill it. The latter claim that the agreements have permitted foreign goods to compete in and destroy their markets, and they have moved up their guns to do some effective shelling.

Secretary Hull issues statistics in an attempt to prove that the trade agreements have been important factors in domestic recovery. His opponents say they have been nothing of the sort, and offer their own figures. Whatever Congress decides to do, defeat of the proposal to extend would send the stock of Secretary Hull as a Democratic Presidential candidate downward. On the GOP side of the fence, it would better the chances of the Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg.

"George F." in Action

George F. Johnson was born 82 years ago in Milford, Massachusetts. His father, turned shoemaker, had once been a sailor. As a youngster George wanted to go to sea. But there were money difficulties and he landed in a shoe shop instead. By the time he was 24 he had learned almost as much about shoes as Heifetz knows about the violin.

A firm known as Lester Brothers, shoe-factory owners in Lestershire, New York, wrote Johnson, Sr., asking him to take a job as superintendent of their shop. The father thought the letter was for his son, handed it over to him, and some time later, with only a nickel in his pocket, the younger Johnson arrived at Lestershire. He persuaded the owners to give the son the job intended for the father.

At the time the factory was going downhill. Presently, Henry B. Endicott of Boston took it over and business picked up. Several times Endicott offered his superintendent raises in salary and each time he was refused. At last Mr. Endicott asked him what he did want. "I want to be a partner," said Johnson. "That will cost you $150,000," the owner said. "That's all right with me," replied the superintendent, "and you are going to lend me the money." He became a partner.

The business prospered. After Mr. Endicott died, Johnson was able to put through many of his theories about the relations between employer and employe. He raised wages, provided free medical care, erected swimming pools and baseball grounds, laid out parks. Above all he made his workers partners in his enterprise. He gave them a fifty-fifty share of what his shoe factories cleared after he had deducted a reasonable return for the capital invested.

In 1937 he had 20,000 employes in Binghamton, Johnson City (once Lestershire), Endicott and Oswego, N. Y., turning out 170,000 pairs of shoes each day. That year he did a business of $60,000,000. How did he explain his success? It consisted of "ploughing back surplus wealth among the people you live with." Throughout the United States and the world, the Endicott-Johnson factories became symbols of enlightened capitalism.

Two years ago union officials started to organize his workers. Leaders pleaded for union membership, claiming that employes would thereby regain wage reductions "made since 1937," obtain strict seniority rights, and do away with "discrimination against employes on the part of the foremen." Tension grew; an N.L.R.B. election was called. On January 9, 1940, the employes of Endicott-Johnson voted. Here was the result: 12,693 workers against any kind of union representation; 1,612 workers for the A.F. of L. Boot and Shoe Workers Union; 1,079 workers for the C.I.O. United Shoe Workers of America. Overwhelmingly, therefore, the workers had refused union representation.

The next day the employes of Endicott-Johnson took a holiday. They held a rally outside the home of "George F."—that is what they call him. George F. was in bed, recovering from a long illness, but he was propped up by his nurse and

managed to wave his thanks to the crowd below. A cycle had been completed. Whatever the merits of the unionization attempts, the story of George F. Johnson is one of the brightest pages in American industrial history.

Revolt that Failed

Throughout the world Dictators Stalin and Hitler have groups of followers, though members of their fraternities have dwindled considerably in recent months. Presumably among sympathizers with the Nazi Fuehrer were the members of the Christian Front recently arrested in New York by J. Edgar Hoover's F.B.I. on charges of plotting the overthrow of the United States government. They planned to do it, so it seemed, with some eighteen cans of cordite and twelve Springfield rifles.

Many of those seized by Mr. Hoover's men were in the New York National Guard or had served in other branches of the nation's armed services, either actively or as reservists. In the early days of his fight for power, Hitler, too, had found recruits among young army men.

If the "plotters" whom Mr. Hoover foiled really looked toward Berlin for guidance, they learned neither wisely nor well from Hitler's experience. For the Nazi leader, with a handful of armed followers, tried in 1923 to overthrow the Bavarian and German governments. A few shots were fired in Munich and Hitler landed in jail. There he made up his mind that it would take more than arms and ammunition to capture control of Germany. Once free, he devoted his time to the development of a giant political party. True, he had his Storm Troopers, but he could not have turned the trick if he hadn't also drummed up a large political trade and thereby won a big part of the nation's vote to make his party the largest in the Reichstag.

The New York "plotters" evidently have a lot to learn, not only about Hitler, but about the spirit and institutions of the United States.

Hore-Belisha Out

Britons were alarmed, pleased or confused—depending on their political beliefs and sympathies—when Leslie Hore-Belisha, Secretary of State for War, was summarily ousted in a general cabinet shake-up. In Germany, the dismissal of Hore-Belisha, a Jew, was hailed with satisfaction and held to indicate a breach in Prime Minister Chamberlain's war machine.

Fitzpatrick—St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Before the last man dies and all the treasure is spent.

Succeeding Hore-Belisha was Oliver Stanley, son of the Earl of Derby, who had been Secretary of State for War in 1916–18. Stanley won the coveted French *Croix de Guerre* in the last war. British army circles seemed to feel that he would "fit better" into the Cabinet than Hore-Belisha, whose aggressiveness had caused friction. Almost immediately following the outbreak of the present war there were reports of serious differences between Hore-Belisha and General Sir Edmund Ironside, Chief of the General Imperial Staff.

Salient facts behind the dislike of the War Minister were that he had "streamlined" the British army, raised the pay, smartened the uniforms, and promoted officers from the ranks, shattering centuries-old traditions. He had also promoted scores of younger officers above the heads of their seniors, and had made Viscount Gort the British Commander-in-Chief in France, skipping him over the heads of at least fifty generals.

While he had been hailed as "Tommy Atkins' friend," there was bitter feeling against him on the part of mothers, wives and sweethearts after he had secretly sent the first British troops to France without permitting them to bid farewell to their womenfolk: the letter columns of the British press were full of complaints.

Again, Hore-Belisha reputedly brought down the wrath of the church by granting "unmarried wives" of Tommies on active service the same allowance from the state as that provided for legal wives. Church groups —which a few years ago were powerful enough to help dethrone Edward VIII, now the Duke of Windsor, because they did not like the idea of his marriage to a divorcee—called Hore-Belisha's action a return to concubinage.

It was also reported, without confirmation, that Hore-Belisha was attempting to institute a "commissar" system in the British forces, to spy on those officers who raged against him. The system was said to be based on "personnel officers" whom the War Minister installed to watch over "personal interests" of the soldiers.

One theory, probably far-fetched but widespread nevertheless, was that by replacing Hore-Belisha—a left-wing Conservative—by a Tory it might be easier to extend new peace feelers to ally Britain, France and Germany to prevent further advances into Europe by Stalin.

Prime Minister Chamberlain, meanwhile, assumed the responsibility for dropping Hore-Belisha and was determined to remain in full command of the Cabinet and "see the war

through." On January 16, in the House of Commons, he denied that Hore-Belisha had been dismissed because of anti-Jewish prejudice, and declared it was "pure invention" to say that the dismissal had been brought about by army pressure.

War & Rumors of War

On January 15, the French Foreign Office warned that Germany and Russia might be planning simultaneous drives against the Balkans, the Scandinavian nations and the Low Countries—Belgium and the Netherlands. The warning came while Rumania was announcing that she would resist any Russian thrust, and while Scandinavia was most panicky over the possibility that Finland would not be able to stave off the Red army. It followed by only a day or two the sudden action of Belgium and the Netherlands in summoning all men on leave back to their posts.

This dramatic move by the Low Countries followed reports of German military activities along their border. Many believe these activities presaged a German attempt to sweep through to the sea for an attack on England. For weeks, military and political experts have been predicting that the European war would intensify in deadly earnest by spring or before. In mid-January, civilian populations of both neutral and belligerent countries shuddered with fear that the day of reckoning might be at hand. Nervously they noted that, for weeks, Nazi planes have been flying across the Channel like migrant geese, mapping vital British seaports and industrial centers for a possible *Blitzkrieg* from the air, and that British airmen have made similar flights deep into Reich territory, bombarding Vienna, Prague and other discontented "vassal" cities of Germany with propaganda pamphlets.

Europe also recalled apprehensively the recent statement by Hermann Goering, head of the Cabinet Council for the Defense of the Reich, in the *Voelkischer Beobachter:* "Germany's air force knows its decisive role in the struggle is yet to come and is ready to take off at any time in the new year. Measures of the Allies will call for counter-measures that will constantly increase in their fierceness. All that is needed now is the Fuehrer's command, and they will meet the blockade with mighty blows, for no land in the world is so vulnerable from the air as the British Isles. *And when our counter-attack is made it will be an attack the like of which the world has never known.*"

Captured German fliers, prisoners in England, declare that Germany has a front-line air fleet of nearly 10,000 planes, with 8,000 secondary ships. If this vast flotilla could take off from bases in Belgium or the Netherlands, to fly wave upon wave over Britain, their deadly efficiency would be greatly increased. It was this thought, apparently, that explained the new outbreak of fear in Belgium and the Netherlands in mid-January.

Scandinavia Tense

Squarely in the middle of a zone where vital interests of Britain, Germany and Russia meet and clash, the three thinly peopled countries of Sweden, Norway and Denmark were hard put to it by mid-January to protect their traditional neutrality as Finland fought off the Russian army on five fronts. Foodstuffs and other resources of the Scandinavian states made them economically important to all belligerents.

Moreover, Russia had charged that Norway and Sweden were acting in an unneutral manner by assisting the Finns. In return, Norway and Sweden charged that Russian airmen had violated their neutrality by flying over their territory. If the two nations actually became involved in the war to defend the British and French brands of democracy against Russian Communism—and possibly German Nazism—Scandinavia might become the real theater of the second World War.

The French Foreign Office statement of January 15 promised "formidable" British and French support to any neutral so attacked. Such support would be imperative.

Little Finland has only about 4,000,000 inhabitants living in an area about as large as New England, New York and New Jersey, more than

half of which is covered by forests and lakes.

Sweden, with an area of 173,157 square miles—the size of California and West Virginia combined—has only 6,250,000 inhabitants. She has 575,000 men on the compulsory army list, while in the Swedish navy, which comprises 6 cruisers, 14 destroyers, 31 torpedo boats and 14 submarines, there is a personnel of only 4,500 men.

Norway, with an area of 49,200 square miles, exactly the size of New York State, has a population of 2,814,914 and a national militia with a peace-time strength of 40,000, with 315,000 reserves. The country has a small navy of 1,200 men who man coast patrol ships.

If Denmark were to be forced into the war, that little 16,575 square mile Kingdom, which is the size of Maryland and Connecticut combined, could muster 60,000 men in a pinch. Although her army is a national militia and every able-bodied male is liable for service, Denmark recruits only about 7,000 men a year, and has a permanent army of 14,000 with an air force of 65 planes and a very small fleet of coast defense gunboats.

Democratic Monarchies

With her King, Gustav V, urging that Finland be given "all the humanitarian and material help possible with due consideration for our own position," Sweden, like the rest of Scandinavia, was obviously aware of the Soviet threat to her freedom.

King Gustav, at 81, is the oldest monarch in the history of his country. Tall, athletic, an enthusiastic tennis player, he looks truly Scandinavian, though one of his ancestors was a Frenchman—Napoleon's Marshal Bernadotte. The Royal Palace is in the center of Stockholm, which travellers praise as one of the best capitals in the world. It has been

called "the Athens of the North" since the great Queen Christina (1626–89) assembled artists and writers there from all over the world.

In her maneuvering to keep out of war, Sweden has a first-rate statesman in Premier Per Albin Hanson—who heads a farmer-labor government, is a Socialist and a close personal friend of the King—and in the Swedish Foreign Minister, Christian E. Gunther, noted diplomat and author, who belongs to no political party.

Norway, separated from Sweden in 1905, has been ruled ever since by King Haakon VII, who is 67. Haakon, brother of the highly democratic King of Denmark, also has strong democratic sympathies. He has excellent support from his Premier, Johan Nygaardsbold, Socialist, and once a saw mill worker. Norway's Foreign Minister is Professor Halvdan Coht, historian and authority on the drama, who is also a Socialist.

The smallest of the three Scandinavian countries which may be drawn into the fiery furnace of war is, of course, Denmark, whose 69-year-old King Christian X likes to ride horseback alone through the streets of Copenhagen, dressed informally, smoking cheap cigars and taking his turn with his subjects at traffic lights. As an adviser in this crisis, he is fortunate in having Premier Thorvald Stauning, the bearded, broad-shouldered "Father Christmas of the Danes," who began his career in a cigar factory and has been Socialist Premier for more than ten years. Serving as Danish Foreign Minister is Doctor Peter Munch, professor of philosophy and an authority in the fields of education, history and economics, who has represented his country at the most important international conferences of the past twenty years.

Finns Win Victory

While the three worried Scandinavian Kings were giving Finland moral aid and physical assistance, the Finns were winning the admiration of the world by their victories over the vaunted Red army. What angered Stalin particularly was the support given to Finland by the United States—the fact that the United States advanced $10,000,000 to Finland, which was followed by a $10,000,000 credit to Norway and another probable $10,000,000 to Sweden. On January 16, President Roosevelt suggested that additional credits be extended to Finland through the Export-Import Bank. To cap the climax, it was announced that Generalissimo Franco was sending Soviet war material left in Spain to the Finnish front.

Dramatic stories of Russo-Finnish battles in the dark north and on the Karelian Isthmus in the south revealed that the Red army had bogged down all along the line. In fact, the failure of the Russian "steam roller" was so dismal that it was reported that not only were the Red army leaders changed but that many officers who had failed to duplicate the German *Blitzkrieg* in Poland had fallen before firing squads in Moscow.

From the north came terrible stories of the battle of Suomussalmi where the 163rd and 44th divisions of the 14th Red Army Corps were attacked by the Finns in 40 below zero weather. Led into a trap, the Russians were set upon in the night. Tanks were blown up, men killed by the hundreds. The wounded were found frozen to death. Newspaper correspondents visiting the scene of battle reported that it was one of the most horrible spectacles ever seen in any war.

As the Russo-Finnish war continued, with Soviet aviators carrying out mass bombing raids over many parts of the country and as the land fighting was stalemated by freezing weather, the Soviet army organ *Red Star* declared that offers of assistance to Finland, especially by Britain and France, were "camouflage for dragging the Scandinavian countries into the war on the side of the Allies." Berlin, too, charged that the Allies were attempting to create a Scandinavian base for an attack on Germany.

The Balkans Bubble

The Red Army debacle in Finland gave King Carol of Rumania new courage, and he warned Moscow against attacking his country over Russia's claims to Bessarabia. To back up his defiance, he was relying

Kato—Japan Times

World Enemy Number One

Baltimore Sun

"You all listening down there?"

on the Balkan entente—the alliance which binds Rumania, Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey.

A similar warning that no Soviet invasion of the Balkans would be tolerated also came from Italy, which may have meant it partly for the ears of Russia's new ally, Nazi Germany. Italy regards the Balkans as being in her sphere of influence. Recent conversations between Italian Foreign Minister Ciano and Hungarian Foreign Minister Csaky at Venice were believed to represent an Italian effort to solidify the whole Balkan area, with the aid of Hungary, against any Commu-Nazi invasion.

Hungary has strong territorial claims against Rumania. But Foreign Minister Ciano was reported to have persuaded Foreign Minister Csaky that if Rumania were forced to fight the Soviet she would be defending common interests. For that reason, he went on, Hungary should withdraw her demands on Rumania for disputed territory. In return, Italy reputedly pledged military aid to Hungary if that country, along with Rumania, is attacked by Russia.

These moves carried new explosive material into the Balkans, "cockpit of Europe," where the first spark of the last great war was ignited. With the reappearance of Russian pressure on this troubled area, with Germany attempting to keep what it has won there in recent years by economic infiltration, and with Italy attempting to consolidate her own Balkan position, the only alternatives for the Balkan nations were somehow to maneuver the rivalry among these three great powers to their own ends or to unite and present a solid front.

Meanwhile, two Balkan countries remained out of the entente. One of them—Albania—might well serve as an object lesson to the others, for it disappeared last Easter, swallowed whole by Italy. The other, Bulgaria, is sitting aloof because of her territorial claims on her neighbors, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Greece.

Far East Reshuffle

The surprise appointment of Admiral Mitsumasa Yonai as Premier of Japan to succeed General Noboyuki Abe relieves the Western democracies of the fear of a Japanese-German-Soviet tie-up. Admiral Yonai, a moderate, and an advocate of closer relations with the United States and Britain, had served in Cabinets headed by Baron Hiranuma and Prince Konoye, which preceded the Abe Cabinet, and is a well-known opponent of military dictatorship. Last summer, he helped to kill the proposal that Japan form a military alliance with Germany. As a spokesman for the navy, he refused to countenance any European entanglement by saying that the navy would have to bear the brunt in any war that a German-Japanese alliance might involve.

Premier Yonai, who immediately named former Foreign Minister Arita to resume that post, promised to follow the policies of former Premier Prince Konoye who, late in 1938, set forth the principles of Japan's new order in East Asia. At the same time, Yonai was expected to proceed at once with negotiations with the United States for a new trade treaty to follow the expiration of the 1911 pact on January 26. Most observers believed his appointment was primarily prompted by Japanese anxiety over the failure of the Abe government to placate the United States in the settlement of incidents involved in the bombing of American property in China. Talks had been initiated with American Ambassador Grew in Tokyo, but it was believed that the situation had been handled badly. Foreign Minister Arita, on the other hand, has long been an expert in diplomacy.

Expected, also, was the quick settlement of the China "Incident" by Premier Yonai. He was to be assisted by General Shunroku Hata, the outgoing Minister of War, who, in an unprecedented move, was summoned by the Emperor and told that it was the Imperial wish that the army cooperate with Admiral Yonai. Described as "exceedingly awed" by the Emperor's command, Hata maintained his post as Minister of War. Plans thereupon proceeded for the establishment of the new Japanese-sponsored Central government in China to be formed in Nanking under Wang Ching-wei.

The collapse of the Abe Cabinet did not come as a complete surprise, although in four and a half months it had shown some promise of permanency. Abe had persuaded Moscow to accept a truce in Mongolia, thus ending the long quarrel with the Soviet state which last July seriously threatened to break out into a full-size war; he had initiated conversations with Washington to promote better Japanese-American relations, and had proceeded far toward bringing the hostilities in China to an end.

In December, however, there was an outburst of anti-government feeling. A majority of the Lower House in the Diet frankly told the Premier that the government was ignorant of conditions prevailing in the country and the people had no confidence in the Cabinet. This expression of discontent grew out of irksome regulations and scarcities, inspiring public irritation. The politicians, who had been in contact with millions of voters, staged what might be termed a revolt against the system of nonparty cabinets headed by amateur statesmen. The result was Abe's resignation and the appointment of a successor.

Omaha World Herald

Just as soon as weather permits.

The National Pocketbook

Figures look discouraging but we have derived permanent value from much that has been spent

ALLAN NEVINS

On no subject is President Roosevelt more sensitive than on the budget. For two years now in succession he has shown in his annual budget message how keenly he winces under the constant fire of criticism directed against his fiscal policies. His message of January, 1939, which was the first of the kind in which he failed to indicate a fairly determinable date on which the budget might be balanced, sounded a mildly defensive note. He proposed recasting the form of the Federal budget in such a manner as to give a special place to self-liquidating investments—Boulder Dam, for example—and another special place to expenditures for purposes which, though not self-liquidating, are durable in nature—roads, bridges, reclamation. Morever, he pointed out with emphasis that "the greater part of the budgetary deficits incurred have gone for permanent tangible additions to our national wealth."

In his message of January, 1940, accompanying the new $8,424,000,000 budget, the defensive note is far louder. The greater part of the message, in fact, is an attempt to meet the widespread attacks made by the budget-balancers. And in an irritable public statement he has challenged anybody to say just how balancing now or soon is at all possible.

In this Mr. Roosevelt shows a clear realization that the most embarrassing issue which the Democratic party and any New Deal candidate are likely to face in the 1940 election is the budget issue. For one reason, his own past utterances can be—and already are being—called up to plague him. In his message to Congress six days after taking office in 1933 he declared that for three long years the government had been on the road to bankruptcy, and that it would soon have accumulated a deficit, since 1930, of five billion dollars. That deficit, he added, was producing disastrous effects. It had helped bring about the banking collapse. "It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed." These are unpleasant words to digest now.

For another reason, Mr. Roosevelt knows that throughout the first six years of his Administration he was as insistent that budget-balancing was only a short distance around the corner as Mr. Hoover had been that prosperity was in the same position. Finally, Mr. Roosevelt knows that the fact that our Federal debt will practically touch $45,000,000,000 during the next fiscal year is profoundly alarming to most Americans, rich or poor, Republicans or Democrats.

In the last eight years the American people have undergone a steady tuition in budgetary matters. They are not inclined to criticize Roosevelt harshly for inconsistency with his own utterances about economy in 1933; they realize that he and they alike have been educated by events. Nor are they likely, in the coming election, to attach much weight to attacks like those which Mr. Landon delivered in 1936. It will be remembered that in his Buffalo speech Governor Landon remarked: "The government, like the rest of us, should not get into the habit of spending more than it receives. The present administration seems to have entirely disregarded this principle. It is paying half of its bills with borrowed money. We are living in a fool's paradise—far beyond our income."

No sound analogy exists between the budgetary problems of an individual and a nation. An individual who exceeds his income will eventually meet disaster. But a government which exceeds its income is still spending only a part of the *whole* income of the nation. Moreover, the life of an individual is limited, that of a nation indefinite; an individual cannot spend to enlarge or fructify his future without risk, while for a nation the risk may be absolutely non-existent. Finally, the individual who runs into debt very definitely owes someone else; while the debts of the nation are owed—well, we all know what Roosevelt and his friends, with much truth, say about that. In other ways Mr. Landon's naïveté of four years ago is hardly possible in 1940.

The country has by this time learned that a great many issues, over and beyond that of economy vs. wastefulness, are bound up in the national budget. It has learned, or should have learned, that a budget may be "balanced" in the truest sense of the word, when outgo still exceeds income. That is, some of the things bought may have a permanent value that offsets debt. Some hard-boiled business men may be reluctant to admit that a government ought to unbalance its budget by initiating public works in order to provide employment. But those same business men will agree with alacrity that the government ought in time of panic to unbalance its budget to sweeten bank loans and commercial paper.

Still other questions are bound up in the budget, some of them having implications very important to States, to cities, and to individuals. Economy is important, and sooner or later out-

go must be brought below income; but as the country marches toward these goals it should have a clear understanding of the choices that become necessary.

Throughout the nineteen-twenties the budget was kept balanced and the national debt was drastically reduced. But the government was then refusing to make a good many investments which would have been well worth making. It was putting far less money into soil-conservation and the maintenance of farm efficiency, for example, than it should have done. Expert judges believe that the value in hard cash of the soil fertility saved by the Agricultural and Interior Departments in the last six years far overtops the deficit of $27,279,000,000 which the government will have piled up between 1931 and June 30, 1940. The government under Coolidge was putting far less money into flood control and the utilization of hydroelectric power than would have been profitable. Moreover, in this Harding-Coolidge period of drastic Federal debt-reduction, the aggregate debt of the State and local governments of the nation was being doubled. It rose, according to the best estimates, from something more than eight billions to something more than seventeen billions. This increase was attributable in part to the fact that the State and local government assumed burdens which the Federal Government has since taken over, and which are perhaps properly a Federal responsibility.

The Philadelphia Inquirer

Just go ahead with your chopping.

To clarify the true issues raised by the budget, various initial steps have been proposed. To begin with, many people believe that the budget ought to be recast in a form which will make a better distinction between different types of expenditures. Senator Byrnes advocated this as long ago as 1932, David Cushman Coyle suggested it in *Harper's* in 1938, and President Roosevelt proposed it last year. In the second place, since the budget itself, comprising 1070 pages last year and about 1100 this year, is a maze of digits which nobody but an expert can begin to comprehend, clearer and more illuminating commentaries upon it are needed.

The President's budget message in January, 1939, was disappointing in this regard, though it did contain one praiseworthy innovation. He offered a boxed table which showed that of the total deficit of about $27,300,000,000 run up 1931–40, some $3,235,000,000 was in "recoverable loans or investments," and another $13,200,000,000 in "durable improvements." This implied that the real deficit did not rise far above ten billions. But this year the President's message contained no illumination of any kind beyond a new exposition of his long-familiar theory of deficit-spending to combat depression.

Governmental budgets may be of every degree of honesty or dishonesty, of utility or inutility as instruments of fiscal policy. The budget of France, as everyone knows, is utterly wretched. It is full of evasions and concealments, some of them extra-legal; it is seamed with special categories, and riddled with exceptions. No one trusts the budget, and year by year the republic piles up debts outside the budgetary limits. The German budget is equally disconnected with reality. It would long ago have fallen into ruins had it been organized on orthodox lines. To maintain a pretense of budgeting, a complex system of categories, and a weird list of loan expenditures, have had to be devised. At the other extreme, the British budget has generally been regarded, in its unity and precision, and in the strict realism with which it avoids special categories, as a model for conservative governmental practice. It offers no loophole whatever for evasion or deception, no opportunity for shovelling capital outlays or loan expenditures into arbitrary departments where their

ALLAN NEVINS, professor of American history at Columbia University, was an active newspaper man for seventeen years before coming to his present post in 1931. He served as an editorial writer on *The New York Evening Post* for ten years, was literary editor of *The New York Sun* for two, and a member of *The New York World* editorial staff until that paper was discontinued in 1931. His books, divided almost equally between history and biography, include *Illinois, The Life of Robert Rogers, The American States During and After the Revolution, The Emergence of Modern America, Fremont, Henry White, Grover Cleveland* (Pulitzer Prize Winner in biography for 1932), and *Hamilton Fish, The Inner History of the Grant Administration* (Pulitzer Prize Winner in biography for 1936). Mr. Nevins is forty-nine, married, lives with his wife and two children—a boy and a girl—near Columbia University in New York City.

effect on the annual balance and the national debt can be concealed. The budgets of most units of the British Empire, and especially of the Irish Free State and India, are nearly as good.

The budget practices of the United States have thus far been highly orthodox—many think even too orthodox. We have a fairly well unified budget, though it lacks the complete unity of Great Britain's. There are only four annexed or supplemental budgets: one for the District of Columbia, one for the postoffice, one for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and one for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Since all facts and recommendations concerning the annexed budgets are submitted along with the general budget, they are not dangerously independent, and need give rise to no confusion. The balances of the annexed budgets, moreover, are transferred to the general budget.

We are told by the expert who wrote the New York State Tax Commission report on budgetary methods that the links between the main budget and the four special budgets are quite adequate. Furthermore, states Dr. Sundelson, any segregations or classifications presented in the budget "are for informational or administrative purposes alone. The deficits

or surpluses revealed in the general accounts . . . are not obscured by any efforts to translate potential assets into debt offsets." That is, we have shown no tendency whatever to follow France down her primrose path, or Germany down her dark back alley.

But while any juggling with the budget, any manipulation, should be frowned upon, the idea that its present form is sacrosanct is of course untenable. Excessive conservatism and traditionalism may serve to keep the public in ignorance of what it should know. It is generally agreed that a real distinction exists between moneys paid for current services—for defense, or Federal courts; moneys paid for enduring and profitable assets—for example, Federal buildings which save rent expenditures; and moneys paid for profitable investments, such as public health, farm education, or reforestation. According to David Cushman Coyle, the budget will be balanced when the first two groups are met out of current revenues. This may or may not be true; the test lies in the wisdom, or lack of it, with which expenditures in the third category have been planned. But at any rate, should the budget not show a distinction between these groupings, or ones similar to them? The old rule which the Treasury Department imposed upon the Bureau of the Budget—that by which money expended for any purpose whatever is counted as a cash charge and chalked up against the year of its expenditure—had certain merits Even money nominally *lent* to foreign governments has thus been treated. The wartime loans to the Allies were never rated as an offset to the national debt—and we can now see that this was a wise precaution. But in present-day practice, to help the public understand the situation, ought not certain groupings to be allowed?

This was President Roosevelt's plea last year. And various observers, including the editors of *Fortune*, have suggested that important lessons for the United States can be found in the Swedish budget. This is a multiple budget system, closely linked to the dynamic social and economic policies of the Swedish government. Broadly speaking, the general budget is divided into two sections. One covers real or current expenditures, which must be met from current income; the other covers capital outlay —that is, expenditures which make

United States News

National expenses have more than doubled during the last decade.

an addition to the national wealth. The capital-outlay categories were at first restricted to a very conservative list. They included such public undertakings as state telegraphs and telephones, state railroads, state canals, and state forests, which were clearly productive and were expected by and large to be self-supporting. But when Sweden had to embark upon activities much like the "recovery and relief" policies of the Roosevelt Administration, capital outlay was given a more liberal definition. Money spent for a variety of social enterprises, even for "make-work" schemes, was included. State loans to funds for promoting dwelling-house construction, drainage, grainwarehousing, dairy-farming, fisheries, and similar activities now go under capital expenditure. These are *investments*. The budget is regarded as balanced when current expenditure is met, without regard to such investment.

DOUBTLESS much can be said, as a matter of public education, for adopting some conservative variant of the Swedish system. A League of Nations survey indicates that this budget has worked safely. Dr. Sundelson in his report for the New York State Tax Commission also accords it high praise. "The Swedish system is complicated," he declares, "but offers an excellent budgetary medium for carrying out extensive and varied borrowing operations." Of course one reason why it works well is that the Swedish government has made it do so. To some extent it presents opportunities, like those in the French budget, for improper manipulation and for concealing expenditures which ought to be charged to annual income. But these opportunities have not been used; and the officers of our own Bureau of the Budget—an arm of the government completely independent of the Treasury or any other department, and reporting directly to the President—could be trusted to be equally circumspect. If we had a multiple budget, or at least a double budget, the public might distinguish more clearly between current expenditure and investment. Moreover, some experts believe that the government would then be in a better position to contract and expand its activities as changing needs dictated.

But whether the form of the budget is revamped or not, the country needs a good deal more discussion than it has thus far had upon budget *realities*. The speech which Senator Robert Taft made in Chicago on January 5, answering Roosevelt's challenge on budget-balancing, hardly touched these realities. Boiled down to essentials, it was simply a statement that, if President, he would economize. That is praiseworthy but indefinite. He said that he would "eliminate bureaus; reduce the number of employees; reorganize." He would "change the method of handling relief, housing, agriculture, and government loans." He would "end grants for local public works; reduce Federal public works; reduce subsidies." In all this, detailed specifications are needed. Would he stop soil conservation? Would he halt the work of the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation? Would he cut deeply into the work upon rivers and harbors? If he would do this, does he believe it would be a real economy, or a false economy?

Economize we must; but before we begin we must decide where, and before we can do that we shall have to divide the budget into logical categories. The first of these categories falls under the rubric of "services," and that includes everything from the postman in the street to the battleship in the harbor. Another large division of the budget is that which the President in 1939 labelled "recoverable loans and investments." This includes money lent to farmers through the Farm Security Administration; money subscribed to the capital stock of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; money advanced to the United States Housing Authority. Savings here are likely to cause great anguish, and in the long run, to be uneconomical. Another category is that of clearly and provably self-liquidating projects. Expenditures on Boulder Dam will unquestionably liquidate themselves; so will those on TVA power projects Finally, there is the great category of public works that are not self-liquidating. Flood control and the building of public roads will never pay for themselves directly, though they may pay so well indirectly that drastic cuts would be inadvisable. Once the budget is studied in the light of such divisions, and once information is presented intelligibly upon them, the public may see the true meaning of a balanced budget.

That a balance will have to be achieved before many years roll by goes without saying. Congress, by the law which Mr. Roosevelt approved February 4, 1935, fixed the maximum amount of government securities of all types which may be outstanding at one time at $45,000,000,000. The great majority of Americans would feel far happier if it were possible not to pass that mark. It is true that expenditures on soil conservation create values that ought to be put on the investment side of the ledger. Ultimately these values will become taxable. But even investment for the future can be carried to an injudicious excess. Since we are living in an anarchic world, one type of expenditure, that for defense, is certain to rise; and it would be folly, as President Roosevelt realizes, not to pay for that out of current income. A deficit last year of almost $4,000,000,000, an expenditure this year of about $9,000,000,000—nothing like this can go on without creating grave perils. Senator Taft believes that by heroic measures the budget could be balanced by January, 1942, at about $7,000,000,000. Certainly the country ought to aim at some such goal.

A final and very important contribution toward better public understanding of budget realities could be made by introducing some long-overdue reforms into the tax system. A great part of our present tax-burden is concealed, while most of the deficit financing is pretty successfully hidden from view. Not long ago the Northwestern Insurance Company calculated that the American family which had an income of $1,800 a year paid indirect or hidden taxes, Federal, State, and local, amounting to $242, which is 13.5 per cent of its annual income. Of the nine billion dollar budget, roughly three billions is financed out of visible taxes—income tax, death taxes, taxes on employers and employees. About two billions more are raised by invisible taxes upon consumption. The rest is covered by deficit financing. If the invisible taxes were made visible, and if in addition the deficit financing were cut down by increasing the weight of visible taxes, a great part of the American population which now cares little about economy would become vocal in its behalf. And that is what the country needs—a population which understands the nature of economy, and which is insistent in calling for it.

Spending for Defense

—From an article in *The United States News*

THREE years have dethroned WPA as the biggest Government spender and shifted that honor to National Defense. WPA's spending dropped from $2,100,000,000 in 1939 to $1,400,000,000 this year and to a prospective $1,300,000,000 for the coming year. Public Works drop: $407,000,000 to $373,000,000 to $117,000,000.

In the same three years funds asked for National Defense spending have mounted from $1,000,000,000 for 1939 to $1,500,000,000 and now to a request for more than $2,000,000,000 for 1941.

Elated service men, set to spend the biggest defense appropriations since the World War, have earmarked their funds for new manpower, new equipment, new bases.

Army plans to spend its $900,000,000 as follows:

More Manpower: Enlisted strength rises 17,353 to 227,384; officer strength goes up 379 to 13,831. National Guard swells to 235,000 enlisted men; Reserve Corps is enlarged, with Air Reserve almost doubled.

More Orders: Educational orders will be continued with a request for $16,000,000.

More Equipment: Gas masks, semi-automatic rifles, anti-aircraft equipment and other material will be speeded along by an estimated $63,000,000.

Navy plans to spend its $1,100,000,000 as follows:

More Manpower: Enlisted strength goes up to 150,250, a rise of 5,250.

More Ships: Two battleships, one aircraft carrier, two cruisers, eight destroyers, six submarines, four tenders and one minesweeper will be laid down and construction of ships already on the ways will be speeded if a request for $369,000,000 is granted.

New Bases: Guam, denied defense money last session of Congress, is now listed for $4,000,000. It would take an estimated $250,000,000 to make Guam a first class naval base. Other sites, including Wake Island, are to be improved.

More Planes: Navy aeronautics is down in the budget for $30,000,000 more than last year, which will bring plane strength close to authorized limits.

Congress has not yet voted funds for this record program and already Admiral Harold R. Stark, chief of naval operations, is urging permission to build 107 ships more than now authorized, pointing toward new construction of 195 ships at a cost of $2,500,000,000 by 1946.

More Training: Training period is extended to 21 days for each of the four field armies next summer instead of the usual 14 days for one field army. National Guard gets 27 days of field training instead of usual 15; and 60 armory drills instead of 48.

New Bases: Biggest outlays are planned at Anchorage, Alaska, for a new air base and at the Panama Canal for start of work on a third set of locks and increased protection there, but other spots get attention.

More Planes: Air corps already has funds to pay for an air force of 5,500 planes so the new aviation allowances are for maintenance and replacement of this armada.

Asia Draws Its Sword

Asiatic, rather than European, Russia on the march may represent a challenge to Western civilization

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

DESPITE Russian failures in Finland, the possibility that the Soviet will make a large-scale attempt to dominate Europe is by no means far-fetched. The direction in which the Soviet is pointing today may be significant; it is altogether conceivable that Russia may be on the way to bring about one of history's not infrequent repetitions: the Asiatic challenge to European civilization. For Russia *is* Asia. It is only an accident of geography that the heart of the nation is located in Europe. Her roots, her traditions, her national personality—all are as intrinsically Asiatic as her vast Siberian steppes.

Three times in the Christian era Europe—actually only a small peninsula jutting out from the immense land mass of Asia—has been threatened by conquest from the larger continent. The triumphant sweep of Mohammedanism, after engulfing Spain in the eighth century, was checked on the battlefields between Tours and Poitiers in France.

In the thirteenth century, European medieval civilization was saved from complete obliteration almost by accident. Mongol hordes, incomparable fighters, subjugated Russia, leaving the permanent impress of their rule, and smashing Poland and Hungary. They turned back from a final drive into Western Europe only because of internal disputes as to the succession in the Tartary from which they had come.

Islam advanced on Europe again in the fourteenth century when the Turkish Empire, with its formidable striking weapon, the Janissaries, who must have been psychologically similar to young Communists and young Nazis, captured the historic Christian outpost, Constantinople, and swarmed over the Balkans. It was a Polish army (ironically the Poles were more successful in saving another country than in preserving their own) that turned the Turks back from Vienna.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Asia was in eclipse before a Europe that had gained immense strength through its industrial revolution. The Turkish Empire shrank. In Asia itself European powers acquired one colony and strategic point after another. It was not uncommon for a few thousands or tens of thousands of Europeans, administrators, soldiers, traders, to dominate Asiatic countries with populations of millions.

Now one sees a reversal of this process. First the Russo-Japanese War, then the World War, undermined that prestige which was so important for the maintenance of Europe's rule over Asia. The European colonial powers were faced with storms of unrest from China to Morocco as an aftermath of Europe's destructive civil war from 1914 until 1918.

Can European hegemony survive another such war, still in a preliminary stage, but with even greater ultimate prospects of destruction, dislocation and exhaustion? It seems highly doubtful. What will become of the Dutch East Indian Empire if Germany marches into the Netherlands? How will the Indian masses react if they learn that London has been desolated from the air?

Moreover, for the first time since the dynamic period of the Turkish Empire, Asia is marching into Europe. By far the most significant result of the present war up to now has been the rapid extension of the territory and influence of the Soviet Union. And, while pre-war Russia was the most backward of European great powers, the Soviet Union must be considered the most advanced of Asiatic great powers—with some reservations and qualifications as regards Japan. The Soviet Union has the advantage in size, in population, in natural resources, in inherited original contributions to human culture. Japan must be conceded superiority in efficiency, in naval power and in certain phases of internal administration.

The political structure of the Soviet Union is overwhelmingly Asiatic. There is a strong similarity between the essential characteristics of Oriental despotism and of the Stalinite dictatorship.

THE first of these characteristics is absolute, unlimited power. Conceptions of democracy, of individual liberty, of checks and balances in administrative authority have no real meaning for the Oriental mind. Could there be a more unlimited despotism than the Soviet state, where millions of peasants were deliberately starved to death because they would not accept collective farming, where the Cabinet Minister of today may be executed without the formality of a trial tomorrow, where a leading scientist may find himself assigned to forced labor in some Arctic wilderness?

Asia is prodigal, contemptuous of human life. Respect for the individual human being is a product of Christianity and of the humanism of the Renaissance. It has no place in Asia, where a huge birthrate can be relied on to replace ravages of famine, flood, massacre and disease. Typical of this Asiatic contempt for the individual

is the Soviet practice, now copied by Nazi Germany, of forcibly uprooting whole communities and transplanting them to some other place of habitation.

In the Soviet Union, German colonists who had lived for generations in the Volga region have been deported to the unhealthy coal mines of Karaganda. Koreans in the Soviet Far East were considered of doubtful loyalty and were shipped off en masse to Central Asia. Recalcitrant Uzbeks and Sarts from Turkestan were sent to chop wood in the northern forests of Karelia. "Undesirable" Finns near Leningrad were herded into freight cars and sent into the deep interior of Russia, where compulsory migrants are kept busy in forced labor. Knowledge of the sufferings of these Finns was an important factor in stimulating Finnish resistance to Soviet demands which were calculated to reduce Finland to the status of a Soviet dependency.

This typically Asiatic practice of mass deportation has apparently begun immediately in the newly occupied regions of Poland, where there has been a roundup of prisoners for labor in the Donetz coal mines, located in southern Russia.

The Asiatic state is profoundly secretive and its statecraft, even by Western standards, is devious and treacherous. The Soviet Union certainly conforms to these specifications. Every diplomat and journalist with Moscow experience can testify to the mystery (Soviet citizens who talk indiscreetly are apt to be reported missing) which surrounds every step in Soviet foreign or domestic policy. And could anything be more ironical, in view of the Soviet share in the partition of Poland, with which it had concluded a special non-aggression pact, than the fact that that violated treaty had defined aggression in these words: "Invasion by armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state; attack, by land, naval or air forces, even without a declaration of war, on the territory of another state."

Asia's achievements are almost always of quantity, not of quality, of the mass, not of the individual. And this is most emphatically true of the Soviet Union. It has taught masses of Soviet citizens to read. It has prevented the individual Soviet citizen from thinking. On its huge state and collective farms, with their modern machinery, it has often committed offenses against agricultural commonsense that would have shocked the most ignorant Arkansas sharecropper. It has built, with the aid of American and German engineers, "industrial giants." And the products of these new plants, after the foreign technical aid was withdrawn, have generally been inferior. It is the tradition of the Asiatic state to accomplish everything by force. And force can sometimes achieve quantitative, but never qualitative results.

One of my most vivid impressions of the essentially Asiatic character of the Soviet regime was gained, appropriately enough, in Samarkand, the capital of Tamerlane, the Earth-Shaker, who built pyramids of human heads outside the cities which he captured and enriched Samarkand with some of the most beautiful mosques of the Moslem world. A middle-aged engineer was telling the story of some of Tamerlane's edifices:

"He brought to Samarkand as prisoners skilled artificers from the countries which he conquered. They had the choice of doing as he directed or having their throats cut. And he undertook works which were beyond the technical resources of his age. But when there were accidents and disasters he always found scapegoats whom he executed as responsible."

I could detect a faint smile on the intelligent face of this engineer, a European caught in a new Asiatic despotism, as he indulged in these apparently innocent historical reminiscences. One did not require much insight to recognize the parallels with the current Soviet practices of constantly finding new batches of "saboteurs" whenever some grandiose plan goes awry and of placing many engineers and other specialists under the orders of the Gay-Pay-Oo, or Political Police.

Perhaps the most important consequence of the Bolshevik Revolution was the triumph of the Asiatic over the European elements in pre-war Russia. One should not be misled by electric power plants, steel mills, great canals, built, incidentally, by a most inhuman exploitation of forced labor. Asiatic despots, with the labor of innumerable slaves, have not infrequently created impressive material works.

It is in the cultural, in the spiritual field that the victory of Asia over Europe has been complete. It reveals a complete misapprehension of the Russian past or the Russian present or both to dismiss the Soviet record with a shrug and the consoling thought:

"Oh, well, things were much worse under the Tsars."

It should be remembered that the worst excesses of Tsarism were checked and abated to some extent by the existence of a liberal, educated public opinion which is non-existent in the Soviet Union. Before the World War, the Russian engineer, doctor, teacher, writer, had his share in the humanistic culture of Europe, to which Russia made a great contribution during the nineteenth century. To the young Communist of today that culture means little or nothing.

What was really destroyed in Russia by the Revolution was certainly not the practice of autocracy. This

The height of the Moslem Empire was reached after Spain was engulfed in the eighth century.

goes on today in a more extreme form. What was wiped out was the overlay of European culture which one found in the now "liquidated" Russian upper and middle classes. There has been an atavistic reversion to Asia, with which Russia always had so many strong ties. That indescribable strangeness of the Moscow atmosphere, that feeling of nameless dread and whispering secrecy on every hand, is the essence of Asia. Not the Asia of saints and sages, of Christ and Buddha and Confucius and Lao-Tze, but the dark Asia of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, whose scanty annals are written in blood.

It is dramatically appropriate that the head of this neo-Asian Russian state should be an Asiatic by race and, what is more important, by background and temperament. Almost alone among prominent Russian revolutionaries Stalin had no links with Europe. He has only twice been in Europe, and for very short times; he is acquainted with no European language except Russian.

Although Stalin has been sparing of authentic self-revelation, he has, one can sense, a hatred of everything characteristically European, freedom of thought, range of cultural speculation, tolerance of divergent opinion. It is no accident that he has killed, imprisoned or driven into exile prominent Communists with Western backgrounds, men whose personalities, to some extent at least, were shaped under the influence of London and Paris and Berlin.

European medieval civilization was seriously threatened in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by Asia on the march.

Two episodes, revealing the absolute Asiatic ruthlessness of the man, are worth recalling. At the time of Lenin's death there were seven members of the Political Bureau, or inner steering committee, of the Communist Party — Trotzky, Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Bukharin and Tomsky. All certainly shared with Stalin memories of common danger during the struggle against Tsarism and later in the Russian civil war. A European tyrant would, I think, have spared the lives of these men, all of whom were beyond middle age, even if they had been detected in plots and intrigues. But Stalin was not satisfied until he had slaughtered every one of them within his reach, along with many other veteran revolutionaries, sometimes without trial.

In 1933 there were thirteen members of the Supreme Military Council, the directing brain of the Red Army, to which Stalin sent a message of enthusiastic greeting. Here is the list, with a brief note on the fate of each individual: Camarnik—committed suicide; Tukhachevsky—shot; Egoroz — disappeared; Khalepsky — disappeared; Orlov—shot; Yakir—shot; S. Kamenev—died; Ordzhonikidze — died; Budenny — still alive; Alksnis — shot; Muklevitch — disappeared; Eideman—shot; Uborevitch—shot.

Stalin's purge of the army officials sapped the vitality of the Russian military machine. The failures in Finland offer dramatic proof of the extent to which Russia's high command is in need of experienced, competent generalship. The student of military affairs must go back a long way before he finds a parallel for Russian blunders in mapping and executing the campaign against a nation which stands hardly knee high to the Russian bear.

When I was a correspondent in Moscow, I could observe Stalin practicing the time-honored Eastern method of sacrificing a few luckless underlings to divert popular discontent away from himself. And could there have been a more impressive demonstration of finesse than to shoot for alleged pro-Nazi intrigues political rivals and military leaders whom he wished to destroy, while he was laying the base of his own understanding with Germany?

Stalin has played his share in bringing about the present war between Germany and the Allies. If there is anyone who has gained from this war and who stands to gain from it in the future it is the wily Asiatic in the Kremlin. The *leitmotiv* of his diplomacy during the last few years (every important detail of Soviet foreign policy was dictated by Stalin, regardless of whether Litvinov or Molotov was Commissar for Foreign Affairs) has been to promote a war between the democratic and the fascist powers upon which the Soviet Union could capitalize. Given the fairly even balance of forces and the formidable nature of modern weapons, there was every reason to anticipate that such a war would be both long and destructive. What better preparation could there be for a new upsurge of bolshevism, the natural and inevitable product of the unreasoned hatred and despair of the masses after the ordeal of a disastrous war? One cannot know whether Stalin thinks more in terms of world revolution or of Russian national power. And the preservation of his own absolutism is his first concern. But there could surely be no better formula for widespread Sovietization than a European war.

Spain seemed to offer the first convenient means of embroiling France and England on one side, with Germany and Italy on the other. Stalin's hopes rose again with the development of the crisis over Czecho-Slovakia. Communists insisted that the Soviet Union was burning with eagerness to go to war against Germany for the cause of democracy and

small nations. This despite the absence of democracy in the Soviet Union and the number of small nations (Georgia, Ukraine, Daghestan, to mention a few) which had been snuffed out by the Red Army.

The Soviet Union made no gesture of even partial mobilization when the crisis over Czecho-Slovakia was at its height. Indeed War Commissar Voroshilov at that time was in the Soviet Far East, "liquidating" Marshal Vassily Bluecher, one of the few surviving Soviet commanders of proved military capacity. Litvinov's proposal to France to begin staff talks, much emphasized by Soviet propagandists at the time, looks much less impressive today, when we know how the staff talks with Britain and France, which were initiated at the Soviet request in August, 1939, ended in a virtual Soviet-German alliance.

But Stalin possesses the Asiatic capacity for waiting. The European catastrophe which he had vainly hoped for in 1937 and 1938 came to pass in 1939. This time it was not necessary for Stalin to bait his trap. Britain and France, panic-stricken by Hitler's seizure of Czecho-Slovakia, walked right into it.

No one had so much reason to be satisfied as Stalin when Chamberlain gave his rash and hasty guaranty to Poland and Rumania in 1939. This meant that Britain and France had virtually insured Russia against a German attack. For Germany could only attack the Soviet Union after crushing or drawing into its orbit the intermediate states of Poland and Rumania.

The Anglo-French talks in Moscow were foredoomed to futility from the beginning. No matter what Britain and France had agreed to, there was never any chance that Stalin, already assured that these countries would fight for his western frontier, would have carried out an obligation to fight Germany. Such an obligation would have involved the gravest risks for a régime that is already undermined internally by executions and purges and by its prolonged conspicuous failure to lift the Russian living standard above a very low Asiatic level.

But the conversations with the British and French representatives were useful to Stalin, because they maneuvered Hitler into signing the "nonaggression pact" of August 1939, which was soon revealed in its true character as a mutual aggression pact against unfortunate Poland. Stalin's trap snapped when he signed this pact just at the moment when tension over the Danzig and Polish Corridor questions was at its height. The war for which he had worked so long and with so many artifices was assured.

For Hitler, the price of German aggression has been a major war in the West which strains his resources and sets bounds to the possibilities of further eastward expansion. Individualistic, democratic France and England, unwillingly and indirectly, but none the less surely, are fighting on behalf of the collectivist despotism in Russia. Stalin, in contrast to Hitler, is in the highly desirable position of being able to extend the boundaries of his Asiatic empire without coming into direct conflict with any major power.

Asia is on the march. Europe is tragically, suicidally divided—the same state of affairs that in the past contributed to the victories of the Saracens, the Mongols, the Turks. If the Finnish campaign is successful, Stalin will have dominated the Baltic while obtaining a wide window on the Atlantic and a convenient—though risky—base for an attack on the other Scandinavian nations.

Stalin may also turn to the Balkins, where Russia was so active before the World War. It is nonsensical to think of Stalin, the typically unromantic Asiatic, as a sentimental apostle of Pan-Slavism. But he may exploit Pan-Slavism, as he has exploited other movements, to extend his power and territory.

It was an old Russian aspiration, the nightmare of British statesmen during the nineteenth century, to possess Constantinople and the Straits. India was another more distant goal of Russian expansion. Soviet power is already supreme in Chinese Turkestan. Russians are more adept at propaganda among Orientals than among Europeans, and there may be anxious days for British political agents along the turbulent northern marches of India.

There remains the Far East. Stalin is not likely to provoke hostilities with Japan while he is involved in Europe. The stage, therefore, seems set for a Soviet-Japanese agreement for the preservation of the status quo. China may be partitioned as Poland was divided, although in much looser and more imperfect fashion.

The biggest prize of all, for Stalin, may prove to be his quasi-ally, the Third Reich. Hitler has already prepared the ground and brought that country considerably along the road to bolshevism. Politically there have always been close similarities between the communist and fascist patterns. Economic and social likenesses have grown rapidly during the last few years as inequality became more

(Continued on page 60)

William Henry Chamberlin, Paris correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor*, came to that post just before the outbreak of the present war, with a background of twelve years in Russia (1922 to 1934) and four years in the Far East. He was born forty-three years ago in New York City, educated at Haverford College, and held several newspaper jobs in Philadelphia and New York before leaving for Russia. Already the author of several books on Russia and the Orient, his autobiography, *The Confessions of an Individualist*, will be published by the Macmillan Company this spring. Mr. Chamberlin views himself as an individualist "who has never hunted long with any recognizable pack," and who has felt himself "profoundly out of sympathy with many of the predominant trends of the collectivist age in which it has been my destiny to live." He adds that he was "an immature but earnest free-thinker in a conservative Quaker college, a classicist in a mechanical age, a pacifist during the World War, a sympathizer with bolshevism when this very imperfectly understood word was utterly anathema. Then, as a result of long residence in Europe and the Far East, he became a critic of Communist and Fascist theory and practice.

Wendell Willkie of C. & S.

This gentleman from Indiana refuses to be cast into any standardized political mold

GORDON HAMILTON

A FEW weeks ago, Alfred E. Smith suggested that America was ready for another business-man President. "If you want a good, shrewd, able business man to unscramble the tax and business situation the country's in," he said, "there's Wendell Willkie. I understand he's a Democrat, although I'm not sure."

As a matter of fact, Smith was wrong—and so are America's newspapers and political leaders who generally refer to Willkie as an "independent Democrat." Wendell Willkie, only business man now being boomed for the highest office in the United States, used to be a Democrat. But at present, he said to me a few days ago, "I think I am enrolled in the Republican party."

However, he does not want to be branded as Republican or Democrat, New Dealer or anti-New Dealer. "Why should I," he asks, "for the sake of conformity, catalogue myself under one of two labels when neither suits me? My political philosophy agrees with neither that of the New Deal nor that of the Republican party, as advanced by their leaders. I will not be a liar."

Such insistence on party irregularity might seem as unpromising a route toward the Presidency as was Douglas Corrigan's choice of Ireland as a stepping stone between New York and Los Angeles. But that doesn't bother the stubbornly individualistic Willkie. And although he is making no formal campaign for the Presidential nomination, he does not repeat the customary coy political cliches about not being a candidate. When General Hugh S. Johnson a few months ago boomed him as a "very strong candidate," he replied: "If the government continues to take over my business, I may be looking shortly for some kind of a new job. General Johnson's is the best offer I have had so far."

Willkie's position as President of the Commonwealth and Southern utility holding company pays $75,000 a year, the same salary received by the President of the United States. That is not considered a high wage for the president of a billion-dollar corporation, and income taxes bite out one-third of it. When he was offered the post of Chairman of the Board of Directors as well, he abolished the job as "too damn stuffy. I would have to be dignified."

"It's an asset in my business," he insists, "to look like an Indiana farmer." Careless in dress, he doesn't bother to look prosperous, doesn't bother to comb his mop of greying hair out of his keen eyes, to wear a starched collar, to keep his clothes pressed, or to buy a new suit before the old one is shiny in the seat.

When he sits, his feet throw themselves over the arm of his chair. When he stands, "I stoop a little now," (six-feet one-inch tall, he weighs 210 pounds). He paces up and down, up and down his office, uttering his opinions with a Midwestern accent and in a booming voice that is always ready for a hot argument—the hotter the better. When he smokes, the match falls to the carpet, followed by a trail of ashes.

His desk, on which his feet usually repose, is messy. On it the other day was Felix Frankfurter's *Law and Politics*, but his reading does not always run in that direction. When *The New York Herald-Tribune* asked his three favorite books of 1939, he listed: Mark Van Doren's *Shakespeare;* Dorothy Thompson's *Let the Record Speak*, and Lord David Cecil's *The Young Melbourne*.

Last summer he reviewed *The Young Melbourne* in *The Herald-Tribune's* book section, saying, in part: "It is refreshing to read a book like this whose author poses no world problems, debunks no great reputations, and attempts to prove no social theory—but is content to make the final years of the Whig regime vivid and alive in a style lucid and engaging, with a scholarship exact but unobtrusive."

WILLKIE is something of a scholar himself, specializing in research on Southern economics before the Civil War. When the nation's book publishers besieged him for a volume on his political opinions, he suggested that he might consent to write about the old South. He is now reading Carl Sandburg's *Abraham Lincoln*.

"Just a clutter of books," he calls his relatively modest seven-room apartment on upper Fifth Avenue, New York City, across the street from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. To go to his office on the 21st floor of the Chase National Bank building, one block north of Wall Street, he takes the subway if he is in a hurry, otherwise a taxi. He has never owned an automobile, although he has bought several to give away and claims the General Motors Corporation as the biggest single customer of Commonwealth and Southern's electricity. "I'm scared to drive a car," he explains, "because I am absent-minded. I'm afraid I would run up a telephone pole."

Besides reading, he fishes and plays a little poker for relaxation, but he hasn't played golf for years: "That's no fun, just chasing a pill around." Once a month, if possible, he "fusses around" the five farms he owns in Rush County, Indiana, No. 1 corn-hog county in America. He raises corn, feeds it to 1,000 hogs, says he makes "a little money" at farming.

A native Indianan, he was born 48

years ago this February 18th in Elwood, a manufacturing boom-town until the exhaustion of its natural gas wells, once so rich that it was cheaper to let the street lights burn all day than hire a man to turn them on and off.

His grandparents (who spelled the name "Willcke") had fled here after Germany's liberal revolution of 1848 fizzled. His grandmother was a Presbyterian preacher, although Wendell himself is Episcopalian.

Wendell's father and mother were both school teachers and lawyers—his mother was the first woman admitted to the Indiana bar. Wendell was one of six children. One sister today is a vintner, the other is married to Commander Paul Pihl, now naval attaché at the Berlin embassy. Two brothers are with Seagram's, one as vice president. The third brother, former six-foot, five-inch all-American tackle while at Annapolis, and Olympic wrestler, is in charge of salmon-canning for Libby. "Yes," says Wendell, "I usually order Seagram's, always buy Libby's also."

Willkie was sent to Culver Military Academy, then to the University of Indiana. At college he became known as a red-sweatered campus radical spreading socialistic ideas, including the abolition of all inheritance as unfair to persons who inherit nothing. He raged against fraternities until his senior year, when he joined glamour boy Paul V. McNutt in Beta Theta Pi: He fumed against the law faculty, but got his A.B. in 1913, his LL.B. in 1916. Meanwhile he was helping to pay for his education by moving houses from Elwood, by then a ghost town, out to neighboring farms, by harvesting grain from the Dakotas to Oklahoma, by barking for a tent hotel during a land rush at Aberdeen, S.D.

Acme

Business and labor in conference. Wendell Willkie talks with David Dubinsky, boss of the Ladies' Garment Workers, and Homer Martin, who heads the United Automobile Workers.

After his graduation from law school, he joined his father's legal practice. In the first case he helped prepare the Willkies won the dissolution of an injunction which had forbidden a labor union to picket. He recalls the incident: "You can earmark me as a man who has no prejudice against the rights of labor. I believe in collective bargaining, and I'm against any business run the paternalistic way, where employees are supposed to be seen and not heard." Today Commonwealth and Southern's operating subsidiaries are two-thirds unionized, having contracts with both C.I.O. and A.F. of L.

Wendell's budding law practice was cut short when America entered the World War. To fight the same German autocracy which his grandparents had fought before him, he enlisted on the first day, was sent to officers' training camp. While there he found time to say to Edith Wilk, secretary of the town library trustees: "Edith, I'd like to change that Wilk to Willkie." A blizzard delayed the wedding two days, until Wendell arrived with a frozen bouquet, which Edith carried to the church. They have one child, 20-year-old Philip, a senior at Princeton. He intends to study at Harvard Law School next year. Perhaps he remembers his father's advice a year ago: "Don't go into the utility business. It's becoming the futility business."

The most lasting effect the army had on Willkie was to change his name. He had enlisted as Lewis Wendell Willkie. The army transposed his first and middle names, advised: "By the time we get them corrected through all the red tape of Washington, the war will be over." So that time Willkie did not challenge the government.

In 1918 he was sent to France with the 325th Field Artillery. He lingered abroad after the Armistice to defend soldiers in court martials. On his return to America, he was asked to run for Congress, but took a friend's advice: "Forget it. First thing you know you'll be elected and that will mean your finish. Move away from the town, do anything else you want, but don't take the nomination."

Saved by the skin of his teeth from a political career, he joined the legal department of Firestone in Akron, quit to take a job with the law partnership of Mather and Nesbitt. As delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1924, he fought for the nomination of Al Smith over William Gibbs McAdoo, because McAdoo was backed by the Ku Klux Klan. But politics were a minor matter in his life. Making a brilliant record as a lawyer, he attracted the attention of B. C. Cobb, later President of Commonwealth and Southern, who advised the law firm: "Don't let this young man get away from us . . . He is a comer and we should keep our eye on him."

Willkie did not get away from the law firm—until Cobb himself in 1929 hired him away to become counsel for C. & S. When Cobb retired on New Year's Day in 1933, at the depth of the depression, he left Willkie as president.

Willkie immediately set about making the best record of any utility executive in the country. Holding the string to a billion dollars in assets scattered over eleven states between the Appalachians and the Mississippi, he doubled the average domestic use of electricity in his territory until it topped the record of any other major

(Continued on page 59)

Polling Public Opinion

The director of the nation's leading public poll explains its functions and defends it from critics

DR. GEORGE GALLUP

ON a street corner in Boston a stock broker stops to answer the questions of a young man with a sheaf of ballots and a lead pencil:

"Whom would you like to see elected President in November?" the young man asks.

"Well, my first choice would be Wendell Willkie," says the stock broker, "but I doubt whether the politicians would take to him. Put me down for Willkie, but say I'm still not quite decided. What's your next question?"

"If Canada is actually invaded by any European power, do you think the United States should use its Army and Navy to aid Canada?"

"Yes, that's one case where I'd be willing to see this country go into action. But I'm against our looking for trouble overseas."

The scene shifts to a backwoods road in Arkansas. The man who is asking the questions wears a cap, and the man who answers wears the faded overalls of a back-country farmer. But the questions are the same. Both the stock broker and the farmer agree that the United States should come to the aid of Canada if the Dominion should be invaded. The Arkansas farmer wants a third term for President Roosevelt. Both men are chance cogs in a continuous process of sampling American public opinion. Both were selected on the initiative of the field investigator, but only after careful and detailed instructions from his home office. Multiplied hundreds of times, the interviews give a week-by-week picture of what Americans are thinking about the Presidency, about the war in Europe and the dozens of other issues in American national life.

What do the new surveys of public opinion contribute? How are they conducted? What are the limits of their usefulness?

The year 1940 is a presidential election year, and more people will be asking these questions about this new kind of research than ever before. Many of the questions imply a criticism. The questioners recall the epic failure of *The Literary Digest* "straw vote" in 1936, and they wonder whether the new surveys of public sentiment are not "some kind of a stunt" which will go the way of *The Digest* in coming election tests. Most of the criticisms, however, indicate a misunderstanding of the nature of the new science of public opinion measurement.

Dr. George Gallup

The problem which the new surveys seek to solve—finding out what a nation of more than 80,000,000 adults thinks—is not new. Congressmen, legislators and Presidents have applied their ingenuity to the problem since 1789. Their chief reliance has been letters from constituents, editorials in the press and in party organs and "keeping the ear to the ground" in general. A kind of "straw vote" was conducted by *The Raleigh (N.C.) Star* more than a hundred years ago on the Presidential chances of Andrew Jackson.

What the new surveys of public opinion have done is to apply scientific methods to the old problem of finding out what the people of this free-thinking, free-speaking democracy wish to do with their society.

In the 1936 election, while most American readers were following the widely publicized reports of *The Literary Digest* "straw vote," which sent out more than 10,000,000 straw ballots, the new *polls* were undergoing their first big test. Using only a small fraction of the gigantic sendout employed by *The Digest*, the American Institute of Public Opinion, the Crossley poll and *The Fortune* Survey all forecast a Roosevelt victory while *The Digest* predicted a landslide for Landon. While some of the new surveys weren't quite as accurate as their sponsors hoped, the experiences of the 1936 election did point the way to invaluable refinements in method and approach. Most important of all, the election validated the principle of the scientifically selected cross-section over the mass-balloting methods used by earlier polls and straw votes.

As the new surveys of public opinion venture into another Presidential year, their distinguishing mark is the use of this cross-section principle. Briefly it means that interviews must be obtained from each of the important and heterogeneous opinion groups in the United States *in exact proportion to the size of that group in American life or in proportion to its numbers on election day.* In the great majority of cases six main "controls" have been found to suffice: The sample must contain the proper proportion of (1) voters from each state, (2) men and women, (3) farm voters, voters in towns of 2,500 or less, and voters in towns and cities of more than 2,500, (4) voters of all age groups, including those who will come of age by election day, (5) voters of above-average and below-average incomes, as well as persons on relief, and (6) Democrats, Republicans and persons of other political affiliations.

In the state of Iowa, for instance,

approximately 12 per cent of the total population are receiving relief or old-age assistance or are on WPA projects. Hence, in a typical Institute survey, 12 per cent of the interviews would have to come from persons in these various "relief" categories, and so on for the other income levels. Approximately 39 per cent live on farms, while 61 per cent live in cities and small towns, and interviews must be assigned so as to reflect this residential division accurately. In the last Presidential election Iowa cast 56 per cent of its major party vote for Roosevelt, 44 for Landon. Hence 56 per cent of the major party interviews in Iowa must be with Roosevelt voters, 44 per cent with Landon voters, and appropriate numbers for the lesser parties, and, of course, for persons who have just come of voting age. Approximately 10 per cent of the state's population are between the ages of 20 and 24, and so the proper number of interviews must come from this group and from other age groups.

And finally, since Iowa counts for about 2½ per cent of the nation's voting population, 2½ per cent of the interviews in a national survey must come from that state.

Essentially there is nothing new in the principle of cross-section sampling. The county bacteriologist who takes specimens of the water in a neighborhood stream at different points, to determine its purity, is making use of the principle. So is the ore-tester who calculates the richness of a lode of iron ore by thrusting a scoop into the ore at different points. What is new is the application of cross-section sampling to the much more difficult business of sampling public opinion. Surprisingly enough this major principle has been completely overlooked in nearly all previous surveys of the public.

"Public opinion," wrote Michel de Montaigne, the eminent sixteenth century philosopher, "is a powerful, bold and *unmeasurable* party." [Italics ours.]

Even fifty years ago, the famous student of the American form of government, James Bryce, thought that the problem of ascertaining true public opinion was almost insurmountable. But Bryce foresaw a day when some new machinery for registering the public will at frequent intervals, between elections, might be set up.

While many students of public opinion are chiefly interested in the new public opinion measurement as a political instrument and as an answer to Bryce's problem, the questions most commonly asked of those who conduct the news surveys are questions of detail. By far the commonest of all is the query: *"Why haven't I been interviewed?"* The question comes from men and women, in honest perplexity, who sit down and write to the American Institute of Public Opinion about it, and it comes from persons who would like to see the polls discredited for some reason of their own. One of those who has raised the question in good faith is General Hugh S. Johnson, who has asked various audiences whether anyone present has ever been interviewed. In a recent column the General reported that in an audience of 1600 "little businessmen" only one hand was raised.

RESULTS such as General Johnson's cause the American Institute no surprise. Indeed, we should have been disturbed if several hands had been raised. In modern polls of public opinion the *number* of persons interviewed is almost the least important factor. Far more important in assuring accuracy is the representativeness of the cross-section. Indeed, it is even possible that a perfectly satisfactory nation-wide poll could be conducted with only 500 or 1000 interviews *provided they were properly selected*. It is safe to say, certainly, that no poll in the history of the United States ever went wrong because too few persons were reached.

If these statements seem strange, it is because most Americans still cling to the notion that the accuracy of *The Literary Digest* prior to 1936 was the result of its millions of ballots. But while millions of ballots are

justifiable from a publicity standpoint, experience and statistical theory both indicate that a point is speedily reached in nearly every survey, *usually within a few thousand interviews*, where the addition of further interviews does not materially alter the total vote.

Consider, for example, the Institute's study of opinion on the NRA. In 1936 a survey of 30,000 ballots was conducted on the question: "Would you like to see the NRA revived?" The first 500 cases showed a "no" vote of 54.9 per cent. The complete sample of 30,000 cases returned a "no" vote of 55.5 per cent. In other words, the addition of 29,500 cases to the first 500 cases in this instance made a difference of only six-tenths of one per cent in the national findings. Here are the figures:

Number of Cases	*Per Cent Voting Against Reviving the NRA*
First 500 Ballots	54.9
First 1,000 Ballots	53.9
First 5,000 Ballots	55.4
First 10,000 Ballots	55.4
All 30,000 Ballots	55.5

In its studies on national issues the Institute generally uses from 3,000 to 60,000 interviews, depending on the statistical problems involved. In a country with an eligible voting population of more than 60,000,000 voters, this means that when the minimum number of persons are interviewed in a weekly survey an individual's chance of being polled is about one in 20,000. The odds against his being polled even in a year's time are overwhelming.

"How accurate are the new polls of public opinion?" is a second common question that grows naturally out of the first. As compared with the 1936 record of *The Literary Digest*, certainly, the record so far is good. In the poll conducted for *Fortune* magazine, Elmo Roper's cross-section sampling came within 1 per cent of President Roosevelt's election percentage. The Institute, which sampled on a state-by-state basis, indicated the dimensions of Roosevelt's landslide and placed 42 of the 48 states correctly for Roosevelt and Landon. In the 1938 Congressional elections, in the "purge" primaries of 1938 and in numerous other state and local elections, the Institute has had an average error of less than 2 per cent.

But while the new surveys of public opinion should generally prove to be within 3 or 4 percentage points of the public's true division on national

questions, it is well to remember that the polls have important limitations. Their accuracy is usually the rough accuracy of the yardstick rather than the precise distinctions of the scientist's micrometer. It is easily conceivable that a national election will be decided sometime—in 1940 or afterwards—by a very close margin. The sampling method cannot be refined to the point of forecasting the close ones with absolute accuracy. The "normal expectancy of error" in samples of different sizes has been worked out, as a matter of fact, by Professor Theodore Brown of Harvard. Professor Brown's tables of probability show that with a cross-section of 900 cases the chances are 997 in a thousand that the range of error will not exceed 5 per cent—even where opinion is divided 50-50. With a much larger sample, say of 2,500 cases, the normal error will be within 3 per cent.

--THE GALLUP POLL-- SET 180-A—12-22-39
THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION
Wants YOUR Opinion

1. If the question of national prohibition should come up again, would you vote to make the country dry? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ No Opinion
COMMENT ____

2. In politics, do you consider yourself a Democrat, Independent, Socialist or Republican?
☐ Democrat ☐ Independent ☐ Other____ ☐ Republican ☐ Don't Know

3. a. Have you heard or read about the Dies Committee? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If "yes", ask b:
b. Which of the following do you consider more important for the Dies Committee to investigate?—
☐ Communist activities in this country, or
☐ Nazi activities in this country? ☐ Don't Know
WHY?____

4. a. Are you going to make any New Year's resolutions? ☐ Yes ☐ No
b. If "yes", What?____

5. a. Have you heard or read about the war between Russia and Finland? ☐ Yes ☐ No
b. Should the United States government lend Finland $60,000,000 to buy war supplies in this country?
☐ YES! ☐ Yes ☐ NO! ☐ No ☐ No Opinion
WHY?____

A sample ballot

THE Institute does not believe it can be right 100 per cent of the time. Indeed, by the same token that we expect to be right 95 times out of a hundred, we expect to be wrong five times in a hundred. The Institute's goal in a national forecast is to keep its error within 4 percentage points and to be on the right side at least nine times out of ten. Surveys on issues, of course, are a relatively simple problem in accuracy as compared with election surveys, since the latter actually involve at least four separate forecasts: (1) the division of sentiment between the candidates, (2) the proportion of voters who will go to the polls, (3) the effectiveness of political machines in getting out their share of the vote, and (4) the extent of such external factors as political corruption, if any, and the effect of the weather on turnout. A serious miscalculation in any one of these phases may be enough to cause an entire survey to go awry.

One of the bogeys which is sometimes raised regarding research in public opinion is the fear that they may create a "bandwagon" rush to what appears to be the popular side. Politicians especially have paid so much attention to attempting to create "bandwagon" movements themselves that not a few of them look with suspicion on polls for this reason. Congressman Pierce of Oregon has introduced a bill in every recent Congress since 1932 calling for an investigation of polls on two main grounds:

1. That they tend to destroy the democratic process by discouraging people from going to the polls; that "winning" voters would feel that their votes were unnecessary, and that "losing" voters would remain away from the ballot box on the theory their votes would not help.

2. That polls handicap the losing side because, in Congressman Pierce's opinion, a substantial number of voters are fickle and can be swung onto the "bandwagon" of the winning side.

How much substance is there to such observations? And how much shadow? Is there a real "bandwagon" influence, or is the "bandwagon" theory merely one of the delusions which has survived the days of "ear-to-the-ground" political methods? Do polls cause the voters to stay away from the ballot box on election day?

In the first place, polls have no monopoly on the forecasting of elections. Forecasts by newspaper correspondents, party leaders and candidates have been an accustomed part of every political campaign in the United States for generations. In the Presidential election four years ago, the most accurate state-by-state forecast was not made by a poll but by Democratic Party Chairman Jim Farley. If in 1940 the polls are to be scrutinized on the grounds that they may discourage voting, or cause a "bandwagon" effect, undoubtedly some attention should also be paid to the pronouncements of genial Jim. How many Republicans will turn around and vote for the Democratic candidate this November if Mr. Farleys says that the Democrats will carry every state but Maine and Vermont?

Fortunately there is considerable evidence to answer both points made by Congressman Pierce. In the first place, a careful examination of the record gives no clue that polls decrease voting participation. On the contrary, since 1933, the period when election polls have risen to national prominence, the popular vote has shown a steady proportionate *increase.*

It would be just as plausible to argue that, by stimulating political discussion and adding to the interest and liveliness of a campaign, the polls have actually helped to increase voting participation. A look at the record shows that in 1936, the peak-year of poll interest, more than 45,600,000 Americans cast their votes, an increase of 6,000,000 over 1932 and the highest proportion of voting participation in the history of the nation.

Secondly, an investigation of dozens of state and local elections in the past three years shows that—as far as the rank-and-file of voters are concerned—the bandwagon theory has little existence in fact. The bandwagon theory assumes, of course, that when Candidate A has once been shown in the lead there will be a substantial shift of voters to his side; that his majority in succeeding polls will be increasingly large, and that

he will poll a still larger majority on election day.

It is hard to say how the theory can be accommodated to the hard facts of the 1936 election, in which *The Literary Digest* consistently, week after week, and over a gigantic newspaper and radio network, forecast the election of Alf M. Landon. Here was a straw vote that had never been wrong, that commanded a far larger audience than the new polls of public opinion commanded at that time. And yet more than 27,000,000 voters cast their votes for the predicted *Digest* "loser," while less than 17,000,000 voted for *The Digest* "winner." If the "bandwagon" moved at all in 1936, it apparently moved in reverse.

An even clearer laboratory case is the instance of the 1938 Democratic primary in Kentucky. Here Senator Alben W. Barkley, the Presidential favorite was running the race of his life against Governor "Happy" Chandler for the senatorial nomination. The Institute entered the state and conducted a series of polls between April and the August election day. The first survey showed Senator Barkley far in the lead with 67 per cent of the Democratic vote. The results were widely circulated in Kentucky. According to the "bandwagon" theory, Mr. Barkley's margin should have increased in subsequent Institute tests. But what occurred? Instead of increasing, Mr. Barkley's popular support shrunk as Governor Chandler carried his aggressive campaign to the "one-gallus" citizens along Kentucky's unmapped back roads. With further hectic campaigning by both candidates the Barkley vote dropped to 61 per cent, then to 59 per cent. On election day, a few days after the Institute completed its series of studies, the Barkley vote was 57 per cent. *The Institute has conducted more than fifty surveys of elections and spaced issues, where the movement of votes to candidates in successive surveys was charted, and continuous studies on this point are being made at the present time, yet little or no evidence of the existence of a bandwagon vote has ever been detected.*

Two final points are frequently made (1) by those who assume that the measurement of public opinion is desirable, but who point to possible weaknesses and defects in present methods, and (2) by those who view such research as a revolutionary attempt to substitute "pure" democracy for America's carefully cherished system of representative democracy.

The first of these two types of criticism is distinctly valuable; it comes chiefly from students of politics and sociology and from the Institute's own staff of specialists. This type of analysis centers on the problem of question-wording (including the view that "you can get any answer you want by wording the question appropriately"), the problems of the cross-section, and the character and value of the opinions obtained. Here, in the field of methodology, there will be constant material for self-examination and self-improvement by the polling organizations. It is the real field in which constructive criticism has not yet gone far enough.

As Professor Studenski has pointed out in a recent article, polls can be misleading when they are poorly conducted. But a badly worded questionnaire is self-exposing. It does not require an expert to know that a question worded: "Should President Roosevelt stop oppressing business?" (suggested by one reader of the polls) is stacked with bias. To eliminate both bias and unintelligibility, the Institute participates in constant testing and re-testing of the questions which it selects for study. Questions are phrased in a tentative fashion and put into the hands of special investigators for actual street and home interviewing. Included among those interviewed are persons drawn from all walks of life, including sharp-eared professional people and students.

"Do you believe . . . ?"

Finally, to discover valid differences which may be caused by variations in wording, the Institute uses a "split-ballot" technique in numerous instances. In these experiments, two similar wordings are used on separate questionnaires. One form of the question is put to half of the voters in the cross-section, the other to the remaining half. The tabulation soon reveals the difference, if any, which is caused by the wordings. If the difference is greater than the expected variation due to the size of the cross-section, then new and neutral phrasings must be found.

In a recent compilation of more than 200 such instances of the "split-ballot" technique the Institute found a greater-than-expected difference in only a small fraction of the cases, although many of the wordings were substantially altered in the twin forms. Experience seems to show that *where there is no material alteration in the thought expressed, there will be no material difference in the result, no matter what wording is used.* In fact, on many of the most deeply-held opinions in America today—such as the popularity of President Roosevelt or the question of American participation in the European war—a very stable opinion can be elicited by merely mentioning the subject, without phrasing a formal question at all.

Another sphere in which constructive criticism and research are being employed is in the direction of "intensity" measurements. Here, the object is to determine which views, as expressed to the interviewer, are deeply held and which only shallowly. Numerous checks, both subjective and objective, are being employed. A voter is asked his opinion, for example, on the Wagner Labor Act, and is then asked: "How convinced are you of that—completely convinced or only partly convinced?" The replies to the second question provide a means of singling out the undecided individual or the person with little interest in the issue. It may well be, however, that the most effective way of measuring the intensity of a "public opinion" will continue to be the study of majority and minority *trends* over spaced intervals. A propo-

(Continued on page 57)

Monarchy and the German Army

Any revolt from the right would have to orient its plans around support of the officer-corps

ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ

INTERNAL weaknesses in Germany, many British leaders believe, offer the strongest hope for an Allied victory—sudden or eventual—in the present war. In fact, Britain has gone to great pains to differentiate between Hitlerism and the German people. Implicit in this distinction is an invitation to the Reich to rid herself of her rulers.

Is there any basis for this Allied hope? Can the stratagem succeed? And if it does, will the overthrow be engineered from the Right or the Left, or possibly by both? And what about the German army and its leaders?

Most frequently mentioned in London is the possibility of an extreme Rightist coup, with Goering in the driver's seat and a royal prince as a traveling companion. This hope is predicated on Germany's return to the "reason and wisdom" of an earlier Reich. But the Monarchists—even with Goering as their prime mover—could not maneuver or force their way into power without the support of the bureaucracy, the church, the middle-class and the officer-corps of the army. It is doubtful whether the bureaucracy would ever willingly surrender or subordinate to another authority the wide powers and privileges it enjoys under National Socialism. The church, while harassed under Hitler, may not carry its resentment to the point of collaborative opposition. The middle-class, thinned by inflation after the World War, is too weak to serve as a pillar for the Monarchists; it has been crushed by Nazi taxation and a Nazi-directed economy.

Fourth and most important factor in any prospective Monarchist coup is the officer-corps. It is necessary to review something of the background and tradition of the German army to understand its position and attitude toward a revolt from the Right, or, for that matter, a revolt from any direction.

Hermann Goering

By the end of the World War the German officer-corps had strayed widely from the severely circumscribed position it once had held within the State. Forgetful of Prussian tradition, contemptuous of the confused Monarch, generals began to meddle in diplomacy and to play at politics. In the early struggles of the Weimar Republic, those officers who had found refuge in the Republic's tiny army consolidated their position by political manipulation.

Germany's treaty army was limited to 100,000 men. Von Seekt created and organized this compact military machine, infusing in its hand-picked officer-corps some of that consciousness which had animated the elite of the old Prussian army. Von Hammerstein and von Fritsch, themselves products of this exclusive tradition, stepped to their posts of command by virtue of seniority and service. But by their side a new type of officer had made his appearance in high army circles—the Schleichers, the Blombergs and the Reichenaus, who put their braided shoulders to the groaning wheels of German politics. Schleicher fancied himself as the man on horseback and played out his lone game to its dismal ending. His brother officers took their cue from President Hindenburg's entourage, listened to ex-Colonel von Papen's advice, and hitched their stars to the Nazi band-wagon. Hitler had pledged rearmament; there would be armies to command and careers to be made.

That some of these soldier-politicos had cast for themselves the role of Monk to Hitler's Cromwell is not improbable. Their clever schemes were soon lost in the ensuing scuffle for the favors of the new regime. The old guard frowned and saw itself displaced by the place-seekers, the latter knifed each other and Herr Hitler helped along the rout of his proud generals by his purges. The military world stood aghast at what had happened to the German army's famed esprit de corps. When war came in September 1939, Von Brauchitsch, Keitel and other rapidly promoted lower officers had survived the storms which had removed their seniors.

Standing by quietly while the regime broke Germany's senior generals, the new men of top rank found themselves deprived of their customary right of choosing their own subaltern officers. The rapid growth of the fighting forces, frantically pushed by the regime, opened careers to newcomers whom the old army did not always deem suitable on social or moral grounds. Year after year young Germans passed through the formations of the "Hitler-Youth" and "Labor Service," and thus as thoroughly indoctrinated Nazis into the army's junior ranks. Yet there the process of nazification had to halt, and the political complexion of the older officers ranges from secretive monarchism, and from the opportunism rampant in the dying days of the Republic, to the colorless professionalism of the present crop of commanding generals.

Hermann Goering entered German military history in 1933, when Hitler rewarded his services as the leader of the Nazi party in Berlin and in the Reichstag by promoting him to the

rank of General. Young Goering had graduated from an army school and fought with distinction as leader of the late von Richthofen's squadron in the World War. Yet he left the army, in 1919, with the modest grade of captain. To the army of 1933 the new general with his self-designed uniforms personified the Nazi revolution triumphantly breaking into the exclusive officer-corps. The career generals may have prudently accepted their new comrade and his organizing genius, but can hardly have welcomed him and his demagogic antecedents.

To this day, however, there is no evidence that Goering has become less of an ardent Nazi to curry favor with the generals. Whatever evidence there is does not sustain foreign reports that Herr Goering has become a moderate.

The result of these conflicting elements in the army's make-up is not only complete deference to any and all whims of the Nazi party-bosses but also a lack of dynamism in military thought. The devices employed spectacularly during the phases of the present war were not designed by army—as distinct from Nazi—leadership. The massed squadrons of planes which smashed Polish resistance two weeks ahead of the army's schedule were part of that air-arm which Marshal Goering, once a subaltern on the retired list, jealously keeps under his own thumb. Germany's air armada and the industrial organization behind it are truly his creations. His is the selection of the men who command the flying force: ex-mail pilots, ex-stunt fliers and veterans of World War air battles. His is the fertile mind which oriented civilian engineering and manufacturing towards the serial production of fighting planes. Its esprit de corps and its uniform stamp the air service as a thing apart from the army.

The Auto-Bahnen and the Westwall, the two chief contrivances so far of the strategy on the Western Front, were inspired by the ruminations on warfare of the would-be architect who rules Germany. Herr Hitler chose another civilian, Dr. Fritz Todt, to execute his dilettante schemes in a masterly fashion and to marshal the army's resources for the gigantic test. It was left to the High Command to adapt its strategy to the Fuehrer's improvisations.

Should Herr Hitler's power slip and should a group of generals, presumably with Herr Goering's connivance, assert command of Germany, what new order would then beckon the German people? What guarantee of stability could this crew of careermakers and gold-braided bureaucrats give not only to Germany but to France and Great Britain should the Allies negotiate a peace with these exponents of a "new" Germany?

EVEN a military junta cannot maintain itself in power without retaining, beyond the control of the army and police, a measure of popular support. This it cannot hold without a social program which can inspire the loyalty of the population as a whole. National Socialism offered such a program in 1932—to the seven million unemployed, to the impoverished middle-class, to employers harassed by labor troubles, to those whom Germany's defeat in the World War had never ceased to rankle.

Hitler's regime would have fallen long ago had it not been able to convince the German masses that it was keeping or was going to keep its promises. It will have to meet the first major test of the people's confidence when it becomes clear that it has failed in its supreme promise of peace. War, even after five months, has not struck the German masses as an irrevocable fact. The war against Poland, by August 1939, had become a popular enterprise as much because of a widespread hatred of Poles as because of a general anticipation of a second pilgrimage by Mr. Chamberlain to Munich. True, Herr Hitler has stumbled into Stalin's grip and into a European war over the initial success in Poland. Yet the man in the street still wishes to believe that whatever fighting he knows of or must take part in is only a brief episode in Herr Hitler's audacious diplomacy to be followed by another quick success and a still more abundant peace.

Once the betrayal of the supreme pledge has become manifest, the Ger-

man people may turn to those leaders —Herr Goering and the army high command—who, in popular opinion, opposed gambler Ribbentrop and his war party. Yet granted even that a new regime could retrieve Germany's fortunes from the stupendous errors of its predecessor, it would have to liquidate those policies which led Germany and Hitler into the fatal adventure of conquest, devise new policies which would obviate the adventure's repetition, attune popular opinion to the new course, and tackle the gigantic job of self-criticism and education. It is precisely for this job that the generals and their Nazi cronies have proved themselves thoroughly disqualified. Furthermore, this job could not be done, within the framework of a conservative Germany, without curbing Germany's greatest vested interest, the bureaucracy, and without recalling the middle-classes and the churches to their former places of national influence. Yet the mushroom growth of totalitarian bureaucracy has fed upon the free areas of middle-class existence no less greedily than the educational methods of the militarized state have encroached upon the freedom of religion.

The devaluation of the German currency, which climaxed in 1923 in the absurd exchange rate of five billion marks to one dollar, robbed the middle-class of its savings. National Socialism rose on the wave of middle-class resentment. Eighty out of a hundred votes for Hitler, in the last "free" elections in 1933, were cast by artisans, small businessmen, white-collar workers and farmers. National Socialism proposed to erect the new state on the solid base of a regenerated and prosperous middle-class. Yet this promise was not kept. The shortage of skilled labor forced the Nazi government to drive hundreds

of thousands of independent tradesmen from their shops into industry. Between 1936 and 1938 some 400,000 small entrepreneurs, traders and artisans have thus crossed the line which separates middle-class from proletariat. Likewise the steady decline in enrollment at the higher institutes of learning bespeaks the acceleration of that levelling process which threatens the middle-classes with annihilation.

The Nazi state has outlawed the middle-class economically; seven years of religious and racial persecution have left the mass of its members spiritually uprooted. In classrooms and official youth organizations the deification of the State and its Supreme Leader negates the traditional ties of family and religion.

The army and its conservative friends have at no time during the past seven years shown that they cared to remedy or even understood the plight of the middle-class. Theirs is the concept of war-economy in which the independent shopkeeper and artisan has no place; theirs is the tacit approval of educational methods which taught German youth, aside from a bigoted nationalism, once more the art of marching in step.

To restore to the German middle-classes their self-esteem, their intellectual initiative, to free the churches from their subservience to the sergeants of police and from the lassitude which grips both clergy and laymen, more powerful remedies are required than those implicit in a change of front by a few army leaders and pseudo-conservative Nazis.

The future will echo the tales of reactionary plots in Germany, may even witness attempts to mask the failure of the regime by a conservative turn-about and by casting Germany again in her recently abandoned role as Europe's champion against Russian Bolshevism. The tales will ring hollow, an army coup will not be the harbinger of a new Germany, and a German people which has not learned to protect itself from itself will not protect the West against Asiatic Russia and its works.

Yet there are unmistakable symptoms that a new Germany is painfully groping its way to the consciousness of the German people. There are reports by an increasing number of foreign observers which speak of the deep apathy of the German people before the appeals of official propaganda, even if hysterically carried to every loudspeaker by the voice of the Supreme Leader. Seven years of continuous stage-thunder have had their effect upon the ear-

Gen. Walther von Brauchitsch

drums of the nation, and the German people, in their deafness, can at last hear deeper, half-forgotten voices.

It is this fatigue with the blatancy of official proceedings, the growing revulsion of an inherently thoughtful race against a thought-crushing regime, which is more indicative of the true state of Germany early in the 1940's than the fabled Monarchist, Rightist and army opposition from on high.

Notwithstanding the uneven terms and expert Nazi-rigging, Herr Hitler in 1933 obtained only two-fifths, and the Nationalists (Conservatives and Monarchists) only one-tenth of the popular vote. The Left won twelve million votes, or nearly a third of the total, and might have matched the Nazi strength but for the systematic terrorization of the voting public. These figures—they are the last obtained by any process approximating free electoral proceedings—must be kept in mind when an attempt is made to evaluate the mass basis of the opposition to the Nazi regime. Whatever else the figures may prove as regards the mind of the German masses just before the Third Reich came into being, they are not promising for the prospects of a conservative Germany on the army-Monarchist pattern.

Hitler has gauged the evolution of popular German psychology more correctly than deluded foreigners dreaming of a Rightist conspiracy against his government. His frantic attempts to follow and to anticipate the growing radicalism of the German masses indicate his awareness of the real danger on his Left.

Hitler's deal with Soviet Russia has struck a blow at the German underground movement in which the surviving die-hards of the outlawed Communist party and the remnants of the late Captain Roehm's extremist Nazi faction seem to have joined forces. Yet he can hardly hope that his love feast with Stalin will coax old-line Communists into dissolving their undercover cells.

The fly-by-night Freedom Station still takes to the air and German radio fans still listen "unpatriotically" to its subversive appeals. The textual similarity of these broadcasts and the leaflets dumped by British bombers onto German cities is hardly accidental. Yet the range of this mysterious movement should not be overestimated. The Gestapo and the average German's aversion to conspiratorial practices set the limit to the effectiveness of the elusive voice which, in the midst of the most highly policed country in Europe, calls for the overthrow of the regime.

The abolition of unemployment, Herr Hitler's proudest boast, once diminished German labor's resentment at the loss of the old freedoms. Yet the rapid deterioration of the working man's standard of living and the rigorous demands of production under war conditions detract from the regime's much advertised achievement in job making.

There is highly inflammable material in all layers of German society but no matter where the spark of insurrection is struck it will not signal a new order if German labor does not join wholeheartedly in the rising. Numerically the largest section of the population, skilled labor, plays an exceptionally important role in the peculiar requirements of German war economy. Increasing demand for skilled workers in the munition industries and for trained mechanics in the army has created problems which defy the compulsory methods of the Nazi State. Both army and Nazi regime must handle gingerly the overworked elite of German labor which furnishes the sinews of the modern war machine.

(Continued on page 62)

N.L.R.B. on the Carpet

Target of criticism from three quarters, the Labor Board may be a vital issue in the coming campaign

LOUIS STARK

Washington Correspondent, New York Times

A BITTER Congressional fight is brewing over the National Labor Relations Act and its administration by the National Labor Relations Board. The clash of views in the House and Senate is likely to be the high point in a controversy which has raged around what is popularly known as the Wagner Act for the last five years. The attacks and counter-attacks of recent years will seem pale compared with this cannonading by critics of the labor law and defense by its friends.

One of the peaks in the conflict will undoubtedly be the report of the House Committee investigating the Labor Board, of which Representative Smith of Virginia is chairman. The committee is expected to cease its public hearings in March in order to draw up its report and recommendations.

Before discussing in detail possible revision in Congress, it may be well to summarize the history of the law, its administration by the Labor Board, the opposition to it and the various proposals for amendment.

Formulated to diminish labor disputes, the Act—originally sponsored by Senator Robert F. Wagner and passed in 1935—was based on the theory that protection of the right to organize and to bargain collectively promoted interstate commerce and by removing causes of industrial strife encouraged the friendly adjustment of labor disputes.

To carry out this purpose President Roosevelt created a semi-judicial Board of three members. This Board and the Act under which it operates is no great departure from previous governmental policy in the handling of labor disputes. The Railway Labor Act of 1926, amended in 1934, created a National Mediation Board of three members to adjust disputes in the railway industry. It is even more drastic than the Wagner Act as it carries prison sentences for violation, compared with the cease and desist orders provided for violators of the Wagner law.

Senator Robert F. Wagner

The present Wagner Act had its genesis in section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 which called for recognition of the right of employes to bargain collectively without interference of employers. When the N.I.R.A. was invalidated by the Supreme Court, section 7 (a) also passed out of existence and a non-partisan Labor Board created by the President was also dissolved.

Then, by authority of a Congressional statute, President Roosevelt, in 1934, set up a National Labor Relations Board which was empowered to investigate disputes which threatened interstate commerce, to conduct elections and to set up regional boards.

This Board, of which Lloyd K. Garrison was chairman, did some creditable work in pioneering the problems of labor relations but, like the previous N.I.R.A. Board, it had no authority to prohibit specific practices which made the right of collective bargaining a nullity.

The Wagner Act was passed in 1935 to overcome the handicaps to collective bargaining disclosed in the previous two years. The new law strengthened the right of collective bargaining by prohibiting employers from infringing on the right of employes to self-organization. It did this by banning "unfair labor practices" by employers. These practices, disclosed by the experience of the two previous Labor Boards, consisted of employers' domination of labor organizations, discrimination against employes for joining labor organizations and refusal to bargain collectively with employes.

The Board was also given the right under the statute to determine the appropriate unit for collective bargaining, whether it shall be by employer, by craft, plant or subdivision or any of these. This is the section that has given rise to bitter dispute between the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations but it was written before the split in labor's ranks. Had it not been for this unit rule controversy it is doubtful whether the impetus toward amendment of the Act would have gained as much headway as it has in the last year.

More than a year ago the A.F. of L. began criticizing the Board's unit rule policy, alleging that it was favoring the creation of large plant units based on the industrial union formula of the C.I.O. The Board denied this. The C.I.O. on its side claimed that the Board "carved out" skilled groups of A.F. of L. craft workers from industrial units and so nullified the industrial form of organization.

Unable to swing the Board to its view, the A.F. of L. proposed an amendment compelling the Board to designate a craft group system as the appropriate unit for collective bargaining when a majority of any such craft made such a request. For a year the C.I.O. opposed any amendments to the Act but last December John L. Lewis announced that, among other

amendments, he would ask that the power of the Labor Board to "carve out" crafts in industrial plants be prohibited.

One phase of the bargaining unit issue came before the U.S. Supreme Court recently when it decided the A.F. of L. appeal from the Labor Board's decision which held that all the employers' associations on the Pacific Coast consisted of a single unit for bargaining with longshoremen. Since Harry Bridges' C.I.O. longshore union represented a majority of the 13,000 dock workers, the effect of the board ruling was to blanket under the C.I.O., for purposes of collective bargaining, the A.F. of L. longshore members in five or six ports where they claimed a majority.

Although the A.F. of L. protested that the board dictum prevented its members from voicing their choice of collective bargaining representatives, the court side-stepped the issue by holding that it could not review the Board's action since it was not a final order. Thus, the Supreme Court indicated to the A.F. of L. that its remedy was in Congress, which had allowed the Board the latitude it took under the Act. The A.F. of L. has now renewed its demand on Congress for the right to appeal unit rule decisions as soon as they are made and before they become final orders.

Work of the National Labor Relations Board up through March of last year.

THE court ruling gave a stimulus to the federation and to those like Representative Robert Ramspeck of Georgia who favor an amendment to the Wagner Act limiting the unit of bargaining to one employer. This is strongly opposed by the C.I.O. some of whose industrial affiliates, like the United Mine Workers, for example, have contracts with regional, state and national employers' associations. This is another "hot chestnut" for Congress to handle.

A further amendment proposed by the A.F. of L., with which employers concur, is that when there is a representation dispute between rival unions the Board may act on election petitions filed by employers. The Board remained adamant against this idea for a long time but finally changed its procedure to permit employer petitions. The proponents of the proposal, however, will insist that it be written into the statute.

Employers also concur with the A.F. of L.'s proposal to guarantee employers the right to express opinions "on matters of interest to their employes or the public, provided such opinions are not accompanied by acts of discrimination or threats thereof." This, too, the C.I.O. opposes, feeling that employers might urge employes to join the A.F. of L.

Opposing all of the A.F. of L.'s amendments, the C.I.O. would provide criminal penalties for violators like the penalties contained in the Railway Labor Act and in the Wage and Hour law. This amendment was offered on the ground that the present enforcement provisions, limited to cease and desist orders and back-pay requirements, "are not sufficiently severe to obtain actual enforcement from those corporations which are still determined to violate the rights of labor."

The C.I.O. proposal has evoked considerable discussion, including the argument that creation of a criminal penalties provision in the Wagner Act would transfer the final authority of fact finding from the Labor Board to a judge and jury of laymen unfamiliar with the specialized problems of collective bargaining.

Another amendment advocated by the C.I.O. is a ban against the awarding of government contracts to employer violators of the Wagner Act.

Employing groups, dissatisfied with the wording of the Act, are proposing a list of comprehensive changes which include the following:
• Unfair labor practices by employes should be forbidden as well as those by employers; the Labor Board should be restrained from encouraging unionization; unions should be restrained from coercing employes to join their organizations; unions should be compelled to respect contracts; the closed shop and the check-off should be prohibited; a definite statute of limitations should be provided so that employers may not be proceeded against long after the occurrence to which the complaint relates; the complaining party should have the burden of substantiating the charges, the Board's function being merely that of determining the issues presented by the parties. Some of these proposals have been em-

bodied in amendments and others will be offered in amendment form shortly.

Repeated attacks have been made on the Board's procedure. It has been charged that the Board is plaintiff, prosecutor, judge and jury. This complaint is based on the fact that when the Board receives a charge it makes an investigation and issues a complaint against the employer *if* a prima facie case has been made. Interested parties are notified and permitted to testify at a hearing before a Trial Examiner named by the Board. The Trial Examiner draws up an interim report. If the employer does not carry out the directions in this report he may appeal to the Board itself. If the Board sustains the Trial Examiner the employer is required to cease and desist from his unfair labor practices and to take affirmative action such as reinstating employes discharged for union activity and reimbursing them for time lost. The employer may also be ordered to dissolve a company-dominated union.

As the Board has no power to enforce its orders, it must file a petition with the Circuit Court of Appeals. Those aggrieved by the Board's order may ask the court to modify or set it aside.

SUCH a "slow motion injunction" procedure of the Board is an answer to the judge-jury-executioner charge. The employer's rights are safeguarded in every step of the procedure. It may take anywhere from six months to two years from the beginning to the end of a case, and even then the employer is not punished by a criminal penalty but merely ordered to cease and desist from his practices. The procedure is the same as that of the Federal Trade Commission and other administrative tribunals. Chief Justice Hughes has held that the procedural provisions afford ample opportunity to secure judicial protection against arbitrary action.

In the maze of charges and counter-charges involving the Labor Board and the Wagner Act several facts stand out:

The Board's record before the Supreme Court has been an extraordinarily successful one. It has been upheld in 18 cases, turned down in two and partially upheld in two.

Delay in cases, unfortunately the rule rather than the exception, caused some of the costly strikes of 1936 and 1937. In general, however, delay was itself largely due to employers' refusal to abide by the law, to 100 injunctions between 1935 and 1937, and partly to procedural causes. In the last two years, however, since the Supreme Court upheld the Act, employers have yielded more and more and have learned to cooperate with the Board. The length of time in adjudicating cases has diminished and the Board, which was two years behind in its cases, is now about a year behind. Although there are still cases which have been before the Board three and four years, there seems to be no excuse for these long adjudications.

Undoubtedly the main criticisms of the Board are directed at its administration of the Act. At times administration has been faulty, because of red tape, over-centralization of function in Washington which has supervised unduly detailed procedure in the regional boards, and inadequate and inexperienced personnel.

Bottlenecks and duplication of work have been responsible for long delays in the handling of cases. For example, the Trial Examiner, after hearing a case, would be expected to read the record and make recommendations for action by the employer. (Sometimes he would be assigned to another hearing and his report would have to wait until the second hearing was over.) If the employer obeyed the recommendation, that would end the case. If he did not, the Board's review division analyzed the entire record and then formulated its own recommendations for employer compliance. This was a complete duplication of the Trial Examiner's work. Thus, there was a premium for the employer to withhold compliance when the Trial Examiner made his interim report because the review division might possibly modify it. If this did not happen the employer might wait until the Circuit Court of Appeals acted on the petition for enforcement, merely gambling with some additional months' back pay to the employes against a possible dismissal of the case by the court.

Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins

A TENTATIVE change has been made by the Board in this procedure. Now the review division studies the record before the Trial Examiner's report is served on the employer. The Board's experience with this innovation indicates a greater degree of compliance when the review division checks on the intermediate report before sending it to the employer.

From the beginning the Labor Board has been meagerly staffed with employes having labor relations experience. For some reason, those in charge of the Board's personnel policy appear to have preferred "green" recruits, mainly young lawyers, provided they had "the proper attitude." In some cases this meant the employment of zealous young lawyers, excellent in academic standing but over-enthusiastic and "unripe" in their views, especially on the ticklish problems posed by the craft-industrial union warfare. Among these employes it is said that a C.I.O. election victory was usually received with approval and an A.F. of L. election victory with groans.

Undirected by elders with special qualifications for handling labor problems these bright young men sometimes went "wild" in their estimates and judgments. Even some of their elders sometimes forgot their legal role of impartiality by awarding the industrial union an extra favor because they felt it to be "more progressive" than the "reactionary A.F. of L."

Fundamentally the Board has erred in looking upon the Act more as a law whose rigid application must cross all the legal t's and dot the legal i's rather than as a broad policy to encourage collective bargaining. The Board has been over-willing to accept cases and fight issues which had better have been left for settlement to

(Continued on page 64)

Democracy Rules the Airwaves

Radio's forums have given the listening millions an intelligent, rounded understanding of public issues

FRANK ERNEST HILL

Director of Study, Federal Radio Education Committee

"America's Town Meeting of the Air! Can Business and Government Work Together? Tonight we bring you another unrehearsed, uncensored, spontaneous discussion . . ."

"The People's Platform! Once again Lyman Bryson and four guests are gathered around a dinner table to talk over an important public question . . ."

"The American Forum of the Air! Listeners from coast to coast are invited to hear another discussion program emanating from the studio of the Department of the Interior in Washington . . ."

THESE are a few of the calls that come regularly to American radio listeners as they sit in their homes before their loud speakers. In this country today, hundreds of radio discussion programs are launched on the air every week. They bring to Americans the voices of eminent public men, business leaders, labor representatives, students, average citizens. Millions listen to these programs. And the fact that they listen is one of the most important developments of a social-political character that can be noted in the United States!

No other people in the world listens to such an amount and to so great a variety of radio discussion on public affairs. Even in other democracies, free radio discussion is usually not so free, and nowhere else does it exist on the scale to be found in America. And in non-democratic countries, of course, free discussion on the air does not exist at all.

In Germany, Russia, Italy and Japan such discussion is pruned to the precise doctrines of ruling groups. Citizens of such countries have no opportunity to hear more than one opinion—that of their masters. Listening to other opinions may be a prison offense. (A German resident of Hamburg was recently jailed for three years for tuning in a French broadcast; the sentence would have been more severe, said Nazi officials, except for the extenuating fact that the poor fellow had not told anyone else what he had heard!)

No, compared with totalitarian practice, our radio privilege of hearing pro-government and anti-government opinions alike is literally as white to black, as different from the Nazi or Communist norm as Broadway at night, with its glare of lights, is different from the Leningrad or Berlin blackout.

The listening to discussion programs which we do in America is important because of the terrific importance of radio. As a social force in the world, radio is less than twenty years old. Yet in those years it has carried us deep into a social revolution which is profoundly affecting our daily lives.

In 1940 America about 28,000,000 American families possess radio sets —27,400,000 more than possessed them in 1922. Practically all Americans spend some time listening before those sets. Experts tell us that perhaps half of our population listens from three to six hours a day. It is as if a majority of us had been drafted and put to work from a fifth to a third of our waking time at an occupation that in 1920 was practically unknown.

What has radio done to us? As yet we can only guess. We know that it has affected our staying at home or going out, our tastes in music, our reading, our purchases of many articles of common use. Just as surely it is affecting what we know of happenings in the world about us, and what we think and do about those happenings. It is at this point that radio as an instrument for the discussion of public questions comes in. Obviously, it can exert a tremendous power on our political and social ideas, and on our practices with respect to them. These radio discussion programs therefore deserve a great deal more thought than we have given them. Let us explore them in some detail and see what they are doing to us.

The best way to begin is to examine a specific program. Let us take America's Town Meeting of the Air. It is the most widely known and heard of the hundreds which are being broadcast.

The story of this program is to a considerable extent the story of George V. Denny, Jr., the man who launched it. Mr. Denny's voice is familiar to millions of Americans, and many of them know certain facts about him—that he is a North Carolinian by birth, that he is forty, that he was successively a college teacher of play production, an actor, a worker in the lecture bureau field; and that he is now President of Town Hall in New York City. They know that he conceived the idea of America's Town Meeting of the Air.

A great many Americans even know how this idea came to Denny. They know how, late in 1934, a friend told him about a neighbor who wouldn't for worlds be caught listening to a radio broadcast by President Roosevelt; and how there flashed into Denny's mind, as he thought about this man, the vision of a radio program on which not one eminent speaker only would be heard, but several speakers, talking to a real audience, expressing different opinions, and answering questions flung at them by the people they talked to—

a National Town Meeting in which all radio listeners could participate vicariously, hearing all sides of important questions.

A LOT of provocative experience and self-questioning on Denny's part helped to shape this idea. Back in the late 1920's, when he was director of the Institute of Arts and Sciences at Columbia University, he had become aware of adults trying to become better educated. At first they merely surprised and puzzled him. "I wondered why they did it," he says. "Weren't they educated already?" But it was his job to keep them interested and satisfied. In doing this, he made a discovery. "I saw," he himself puts it, "that whatever the subject might be, people could be attracted only by one of two devices—the presentation of a personality or the putting on of a show."

He kept this discovery in mind when he became Associate Director of the League for Political Education in 1930. He had already discovered that debates of themselves were not wholly satisfactory. At Town Hall, the headquarters of the League, he found the Economic Club, and noticed that its members liked to ask questions of speakers who appeared before them. Radio was becoming more and more of a force just then; Denny noticed that the Foreign Policy Association had begun to broadcast its meetings. Town Hall had meetings with prominent speakers; Denny took charge of these. He thought of putting them on the air, but for a time did nothing about it.

In the end, the Man Who Wouldn't Listen to Roosevelt was proved the chemical agent that precipitated Denny's experiences and questionings into a coherent plan. Instinctively he wanted personalities on his radio program. He wanted the reality of an actual audience to whom these personalities would speak—an audience whose applause could be heard by radio listeners. He reached back into American experience and got the town crier and his bell. He thought of making the "real" audience ask questions of the speakers. Thus he had both personalities (including the personality of an audience) and a "show." He felt that the arrangement would guarantee interest on the part of radio listeners.

It did. Denny got the National Broadcasting Company to put on six discussion programs as an experiment, and the "show" pleased and aroused America. The first broadcast on May 30, 1935, brought more than three thousand letters. Radio discussion of public questions immediately "sold" itself, partly because it presented all the important opinions on a subject, but chiefly because it was dramatized.

Since America's Town Meeting of the Air began to function, all American radio discussion programs have tried to put on a "show," and most of them have brought personalities to radio listeners. Relatively few of Lyman Bryson's guests on The People's Platform are nationally known, but all are personalities in that they are carefully selected to stir the curiosity and interest of the millions who hear them.

Most Americans have a clear picture of the microphone end of one of Denny's Town Meetings. Some of them have visited Town Hall in New York and formed a part of the actual audience that assembles an hour before the broadcast, and carries on a discussion under the leadership of men like Arthur Bestor and Harry Overstreet. Toward the end of the hour the speakers who will take part in the broadcast appear and seat themselves behind the speaker's stand. With them comes George Denny. Microphones are adjusted to catch the words of the featured guests and the applause and questions of the audience. Then the crier rings his bell and launches his summons, "Town Hall tonight!"; Denny is introduced; and for half an hour the two, three, or four speaker-guests present their uncensored opinions. Then the meeting is thrown open to questions from the audience. Denny guides this latter part of the program, which with its swift give and take is the climax of the evening.

It is a good show. The men and women who participate as principals are always notable and usually eminent. Here Cabinet officers like Secretary Ickes, writers like John T. Flynn, distinguished foreigners like ex-Premier Van Zeeland of Belgium, political leaders like Norman Thomas, Senator Taft, and Earl Browder, and business men like Wendell Willkie and Floyd Odlum have appeared. The questions from the audience are often shrewd, sometimes devastating; they are such questions as are in the minds of the millions of radio listeners.

But what of the loud speaker end of the program? How do Americans use a discussion program like this?

They listen as individuals and families; they write vigorous letters to Town Meeting headquarters. They say that the program has made them talk, think, read. Perhaps we can get at them best by looking at a few of the listening groups into which many of them have organized in order to make a more intensive use of the programs.

These listening groups sprang up spontaneously. Several years ago letters began to come to Town Hall saying: "We listen as a group to your program, and talk about it." Denny said to his associates: "Let's help these people to do a better job." Accordingly, to provide advice and printed material for the groups, a service was organized, the Town Hall Advisory Service, directed by Chester D. Snell, formerly Dean of the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin.

A MANUAL for group leaders, questions to be considered in connection with coming broadcasts, lists of books and articles that might be read, biographies of the speakers—such materials were offered to listening groups at cost. Last year more than twelve hundred persons and groups invested in the service. This year it looks as if double that number will subscribe. Other active groups which do not yet subscribe are of course numerous.

What is a listening group like? Well, the groups differ widely. One may consist of several hundred persons, meeting in the hall of a university, or in an actual "town hall," or in a church or a community center or a Y.M.C.A. Another may comprise only fifteen or twenty persons, and its meeting place may be a C.C.C. camp, a college fraternity, a woman's club, or a private home.

Here, for example, is a group in Plainfield, New Jersey. It assembles just a few minutes before 9.30 on

Thursday evenings, when the program goes on in the Eastern states. Its leader is an American citizen who was born in Germany, and served as a soldier in the German army during the World War. And his name is Fuerer! But he is a democratic "leader" who boasts that he has brought together persons of all kinds of political beliefs—Democrats, Communists, Socialists, Republicans. "We think," he said, "that we are even going to get a Nazi, an exchange student from Germany at Columbia University!"

As the broadcast goes on, the group is quiet and attentive. When it ends, the discussion shifts from the air into the room where the group sits. And it is a sharp and thought-provoking discussion.

A college teacher tilts with a business man. A young stenographer working in New York City puts in her opinion. Back and forth, with heated vigor at times, but with good-humored tolerance, the talk surges. The speakers on the program and group members alike come under fire. There is no group decision—these Americans don't want it. What they want is to learn as much as they can about the subject being discussed, to try out the strength of different viewpoints, and then to consider at leisure what they have heard.

Other groups have different practices. Some meet an hour previous to the broadcast, and hold a discussion of their own before the program comes on. Some tune out when the audience at Town Hall begins to fire its questions at the speakers, and put their own questions—to each other. Some have a change of leader with every meeting; some keep the same leader. Practice varies with geography and group inclination. On the Pacific coast the broadcast is heard at 6.30 P.M., and a number of groups dine while they listen.

Inspired by America's Town Meeting of the Air, local Town Halls have sprung up in many parts of the United States. They hold their own formal discussions, and sometimes broadcast them. Denny looks forward to a thousand "town halls" throughout America, with fifty thousand discussion groups. The physical Town Hall in New York will grow, incidentally; plans have been made for a five-story addition to the present three-story building, with rooms and auditoriums for meetings, including an open-air auditorium on the roof.

America's Town Meeting of the Air is only one discussion program. The People's Platform, The American Forum of the Air, and the Chicago Round Table reach their millions also, putting on different types of "shows." And there are innumerable programs less widely known, such as Public Discussion Clinic, coming from Station WHA in Madison, Wisconsin; Round Table Discussion, KRKD, Los Angeles; Open Forum, KMTR, in the same city; a program of the same title from KMOX in St. Louis; and various forums in other parts of the land.

Is such activity a new thing in America? It is new as far as radio is concerned, yes; but discussion groups existed in America before the Revolution; they have been active throughout our history. In the nineteenth century the lyceums were notable centers of debate; "dinner clubs" devoted to discussion are scattered throughout the country today,

(Continued on page 63)

An important part of the work of the Town Hall is the preparation of materials for the course in Current Issues and for the services to the radio-discussion group. Members of the staff shown above, from left to right, are Mary W. Brantly, Chester D. Snell, Director of the Advisory Service, Byron B. Williams, and Arthur Northwood, Jr.

Uncle Sam Counts Noses

The 1940 census is the world's greatest quiz and the most elaborate statistical job ever attempted

GEORGE F. WILLISON

DURING the 30 days of April this year 132,000,000 of us will answer or be answered for in the greatest quiz session of all time. The questioner will be Uncle Sam, in the throes of his sixteenth decennial attack of curiosity about his people. In every city, town, hamlet, lonely ranch house and trailer, all day long, Sundays and evenings, polite enumerators will unfold sheets of paper the size of a pillowcase and ask Where were you born? How old are you? Is this your first marriage? What language did you speak as a child? How many weeks did you work in 1939? Where were you living on April 1st, 1935?

For the Census is coming, and the Census is serious business. Periodically Uncle Sam must count his family, and find out what they are up to. Not out of idle curiosity, but because we need to know the facts about ourselves, where we progress, and where we fail.

The size of the job staggers the imagination. During those 30 days 120,000 enumerators will knock at the doors of the country's 33,000,000 homes, gathering facts simultaneously for three separate counts—population, the farm census, and the housing census. For several years every step has been planned, every inch of the country specially mapped; for several months great batteries of electrical machines intelligent enough to do everything but predict the winner of the Irish Sweepstakes will digest the findings and sort them out into significant piles. The mere physical bulk of the census forms, each bearing hundreds and even thousands of facts, is such that 60 mail cars are needed to carry them from Washington to the local offices.

The census of business and manufactures and that of mines and quarries have already begun. For five months beginning in January, a small army of 12,000 enumerators will harvest a bumper crop of important data from 1,700,000 retailers, 750,000 service businesses, 200,000 manufacturers, 50,000 theaters and an equal number of hotels and tourist camps. The Census Bureau, the world's largest organization for making sense out of statistics, measures business every two years, agriculture every five years, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines, collects facts about mines every ten years. This year they are all being done, together with the monster population count. When all of these minute fragments of the gigantic jigsaw puzzle have been fitted together—and thanks to the magic of tabulating machines it won't take long—we shall have the most detailed and exhaustive survey ever made of the human and material resources of the United States.

On the returns, communities will base their estimates of needs for the next decade in housing, water supply, transportation, hospitals, schools. Business men will schedule production and sales programs after studying shifts in population, per capita sales, retail volume, income, as they are revealed for the country as a whole and for specific areas. Legislators will at last have figures on which to base laws dealing with unemployment and relief. On the scientific data of the census will be founded all realistic, genuine statesmanship for the next ten years.

Never were either facts or statesmanship so needed. One after another, earlier censuses told the amazing story of our growth. But this one comes after ten years of unparalleled crisis and depression. Before now we have always found that we have gone forward. This time we may find that we have gone back in some respects, or sideways.

We have been told that our population is in danger of becoming stable along toward 1965, after which time it will gently decline. Will the 1940 census give support to this prediction? Will the sad suspicion be confirmed that children are a smaller percentage of the population than ever before? Has the gradual drift of our people from farm to town been checked, or even reversed (as seems likely), by the depression years? Has the rapid industrialization of the South continued to attract workers? Will Chattanooga and other cities of that region show the 100 per cent gain they did in the 1920's?

And where now are the people who fled the flooded areas and the Dust Bowl? How many despairing farm families have taken to the road? Here is the reason for the question, Where did you live on April 1, 1935? For the first time in our history we are to have some figures about the complicated migrations of our restless people.

We have to have a census every ten years. There's a law about it, solidly embedded in Section 3 of the very first article of the Constitution. The Census is a fundamental instrument of our democracy: unless the people are counted at regular intervals, their representation in Congress will be unfairly based.

A year after the Constitution was signed, we counted our people for the first time. It is a far cry from the 1940 Census, the most elaborate ever

undertaken, to the census of 1790. At President Washington's order, the seventeen United States Marshals hired 650 assistants and set forth on horseback, in stagecoaches, and afoot, to count the population of the infant Republic within nine months. Eighteen months later, so difficult was the task, Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson proudly announced a total of almost four million people, about as many as now live in Chicago. In 1790 Chicago was not born, Washington was a swamp, New York, with 33,000, had just outstripped Philadelphia, the national capital; St. Louis and New Orleans were under the Spanish flag, and Los Angeles was a settlement of a dozen scattered adobe houses.

There were six cities over 8,000 in 1790. In 1930 there were 1208, and almost half the population lived in them.

On several vital questions the 1940 Census will gather data for the first time. It will give us facts, instead of the guesses we have had so far, about our chief problem—unemployment. Not only how many are out of a job in April, but whether they had one before, and at what kind of work. How many young people have come of age in recent years, and never held a regular job? At what age levels, and in what parts of the country, is unemployment most severe?

LIFE EXPECTANCY INCREASES

FEW issues have been discussed with more heat and less nation-wide knowledge than housing. Here again the Census will replace debate with unassailable figures, down to the last mortgage and bath tub. Is one third of the Nation inadequately housed? How many of us own our own homes, how many pay rent, and how much? Is our house a one family or a multiple family dwelling? How many rooms has it, for how many people? Is it made of wood, brick, or stucco? Has it running water, a radio, a refrigerator? How do we heat and light it? Does it need repair? When was it built? If, as many people believe, the slack of the depression can most quickly be taken up by building houses, perhaps this survey will be decisive in starting the wheels to turning at topspeed.

We seek new light also in the field of education. We shall find out how many young people are now in school, how many grades the older ones went through. We have, until now, always seen a steady increase in the percentage of children between the ages of five and 17 enrolled in the public schools. The 1930 census placed the figure at 81.3 per cent. But 1934 and 1936 estimates gave identical figures, 83.6 per cent, and indicated that average daily attendance had actually declined. Enrollments in high schools both in actual numbers and in percentage of population have continued to grow, but the rate of that increase has slowed up appreciably, and the number of students in normal schools and teachers colleges has actually declined. Between 1932 and 1934 enrollment in universities, colleges and professional schools dropped, but by 1936 had picked up again. The 1940 count may show whether these falterings are due to temporary conditions or indicate a trend. It will certainly show a good deal about the relationship of schooling to unemployment, income and locality.

One traditional question has at last been dropped. In April, Americans will not be asked whether they can read or write. We know the answer: illiteracy has all but vanished from the land except among the aged—an achievement we may well be proud of. In decades to come, the dropping of other questions may prove to be a measure of our progress.

Business men seeking markets, economists, all public officials, will watch with keen interest the answer to question 32: What is our income, and other answers which will show where that money comes from—wages, business, or relief. Tax experts will be interested, too, but not for reasons which should cause anyone to hide the truth. In this case, the government's left hand is strictly forbidden to know what its right hand finds out about any individual, and John Smith's personal answer, pooled with those of a thousand other Smiths, will never be used against him by the tax collector.

Nor is this the end of Uncle Sam's gigantic stock taking. For the first time, sales finance companies (but not personal finance or small loan companies) will report data never before collected on consumer debt, especially instalment buying. The farm census will yield information much more detailed than ever before on mechanized agriculture, on the ratio of cash crops to general produce, on the growth of promising new crops such as tung nuts and soy beans. Real dirt farmers will be separated from suburbanites with a garden patch and gentlemen farmers whose milk cost them a dollar a quart. Farm labor will be broken down to show the number of family workers and regular or seasonal hired hands. In the business and manufacture schedules employees, wages, products will be divided into categories, and a new question will yield valuable data on capital expenditures for expansion and new equipment, a vital factor in our economy.

To the few misguided souls who may cry "inquisition" or grumble about government "snooping," it should be said that the most searching questions were suggested by the American people themselves—in large part our business men. Jonesville's bankers, grocers and realtors want the Census to find out whether all those "To Let" signs on Main Street mean the existence of superfluous retail stores. Farmers want to know which crops command the most profitable market, and where that market is. Industry cannot gear supply to demand without the accurate picture of our economy which the Census will paint.

The questions were not arbitrarily thought up by a little group of "bureaucrats" in Washington. Of the thousands of questions proposed, only a sensible and revealing handful won a place on the wide white sheets. Cranks, faddists, selfish interests with axes to grind, wanted the Census to ask such things as "Are you a blond?" "Do you own a burial plot?" "How many miles do you travel on your vacation?" "Is your silverware plate or sterling?" They were mercilessly rejected. The questions we shall be asked are as few and pointed as possible, and so simple that they can be answered by the average housewife, who is usually the person interviewed. Though the Census Bureau is ultimately responsible, the sifting of suggested questions was almost entirely performed by an advisory committee of six distinguished members of the American Statistical Association, after consulting business men, farm and labor leaders, economists, sociologists, Federal and local government officials, and experts in "larithmics," a ten dollar word used to describe the science of studying human beings in enormous quantities.

The huge complicated apparatus awaits only the signal to go; the army of enumerators, officered by 104 tested and specially trained census area managers and over 2,000 district supervisors, is being rapidly assembled to receive instruction before invading the 143,000 enumeration units. The mapping of these units above has required two years' careful work by 150 expert cartographers.

Armed with their maps and forms, early on April 1st the enumerators, tactful and conciliatory, will begin their questioning. If the housewife has two babies in the bath and a pot of vegetables burning on the stove, it is obviously not the time to call and inquire whether she is single, married, widowed or divorced. Foot-in-the-door tactics are out, and will not be necessary in most cases anyhow. Sometimes in small communities where anybody's business is everybody's business, some reluctance is shown in giving information to an enumerator known as a neighbor, but experience has shown that this is not a major problem. Enumerators known to their neighbors get better results on the whole than strangers brought in from outside. Many an enumerator has named the new baby, or been consulted as to whether Jane should marry that young fellow across the street. To educate the public, and create confidence and good will, voluntary local committees everywhere are even now publicizing the purpose and importance of the Census.

Growth of the Continental United States. Each man represents four million people.

In crowded cities an enumerator will have to hustle to cover a few city blocks; in the open spaces of the West he may roam over a whole county. All told, the enumerators will roll up a mileage equivalent to a hundred round trips to the moon. The language difficulties of our cosmopolitan melting pot will not slow them up; "trouble shooters" speaking Chinese or Japanese will operate on the West Coast; elsewhere there will be available others fluent in a hundred strange tongues.

The roving nature of our people offers a special problem, and April 8th has been designated as the day when a great effort will be made to count our wanderers and transients, not only by a crosscheck in their home towns, but by descending on all the nation's hotels, trailer camps, "jungles," and hobo-laden freight trains.

There will be other complications: the very old are inclined to overstate, and the middle aged to understate, their age—sometimes preposterously. Others really do not know when they were born, or where. And how to define "home"? It is where we regularly live and lay our heads; if it so happens that our heads lie in one county and our feet in another, then home is at the pillow end. And every day, as the enumerators make their rounds, the stork flies in at 6,000 windows, and 4,000 souls depart to be counted in another census—heavenly or "other". Curiously, those who die in April will be counted, while those who are born will not—in spite of the sometimes strident insistence of proud parents—for the census is taken as of April 1st.

The instant the giant quiz is over, the returns are shipped to Washington for tabulation. Here a minor miracle begins, as uncanny electrical machines, guided by the nimble fingers of 4000 operators, reduce mountains of data to little holes punched on cards. The cards, after being checked by verification machines with a most inhuman capacity for detecting error, are fed into batteries of sorting machines, which can be worked in various combinations by plugging in lines much as on a telephone switchboard. Does someone want to know the number of turkeys in each of 3000 counties, or the number of married plasterers in St. Paul? Just set the machines, and the last

(Continued on page 62)

What's YOUR Opinion?

A monthly department conducted by George V. Denny, Jr., founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air and President of Town Hall, New York

The Question this month:

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES MEDIATE IN EUROPE?

Answers by: H. V. KALTENBORN, JAMES T. SHOTWELL, FREDERICK J. LIBBY, ELMER DAVIS, CONGRESSMEN KNUTSON AND WOODRUFF, WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE AND OTHERS

"AND if Germany had won the last war!—" My friend held forth at length on one of the great "if's" of history.

If we could see ourselves a hundred years from now looking back on these critical days in the middle of the twentieth century, I wonder how we would appraise our own actions? No greater opportunity ever faced any nation than the opportunity which faces the American people today. Strategically situated on the map of the world, embracing an area abundantly rich in natural resources, with a capacity to produce unparalleled in history, inhabited by 130 million free, literate, energetic and competent people, we must demonstrate in this moment of history that we are worthy of these responsibilities.

To make this statement is not necessarily to answer this month's question in the affirmative. It may be that we can meet our responsibilities best by maintaining complete aloofness from the war in Europe. Perhaps we should not have intervened in 1917. I know of at least two British statesmen who said they wished we had not interfered in 1917 as there might then have been some hope for a negotiated peace rather than the peace of Versailles.

But suppose the Germans had won the war, as my friend suggests; what kind of peace might the world have seen then? Who knows? Would France have produced a Hitler and England a Mussolini? If we speculate upon what might have happened in the past, had certain things been different, it is only for the purpose of suggesting that we consider possible alternatives for the course of action we should take in the future.

There are several courses open to us. We can pursue a policy of complete isolation as suggested by Senator Nye of North Dakota. On the other hand, we can prepare now to enter the conflict as soon as American public opinion is prepared to take that step. Then there are the in-between courses. There is one fostered by Secretary Hull, through his trade agreements. Then there are those, like our first contributor this month, Dr. Frederick J. Libby, Executive Secretary of the National Council for the Prevention of War, who believe firmly in a policy of peace, but feel that President Roosevelt should step in immediately and offer himself as the mediator in association with Mussolini, the Pope and other neutrals. Dr. Libby says:

> EACH week (Thursdays), over N.B.C.'s Blue Network, you hear Mr. Denny and celebrated national figures on America's Town Meeting of the Air, the country's most popular radio forum. In this department in CURRENT HISTORY, Mr. Denny assembles a cross-section of opinion on controversial questions by outstanding authorities, as well as special sections of opinion by readers.
>
> We will be glad to have our readers send in their opinions now on this month's question, "Should the United States Mediate in Europe?" Letters should not exceed three hundred words and should be mailed before February 12. They should be addressed to:
>
> George V. Denny, Jr.
> CURRENT HISTORY
> 420 Madison Avenue
> New York, N. Y.

Frederick J. Libby

"If President Roosevelt should fail to express the great yearning of the American people that the fighting in Europe stop and neutral mediation start, an awful responsibility will rest upon him. So far as one can see, he is the one man in the world to whom the British and the French, at least, would listen. If he associates himself with Mussolini and the Pope and preferably with as many of the neutrals as possible, their combined influence would be irresistible.

"For the neutral nations have as great a stake in preventing this war as the citizens of a city have in preventing a bloody strike in their midst. Some of them, like Belgium and Holland and the Scandinavian countries, are being penalized thus far almost more than the belligerents. They will be utterly ruined by a three-year war, even if they do not become its battleground. Even the most distant countries are paying a heavy price in permitting Great Britain, France and Germany to 'shoot it out.' In the modern interdependent world, resort to the war method has become intolerable and must be abandoned for the good of all concerned, as is beginning to be recognized.

"Careful attention will have to be given to the technique of neutral mediation. Our growing national experience in the mediation of labor disputes is teaching us that the mediation commission must, to begin

with, possess the confidence of both sides. It is not their privilege to dictate the terms of settlement as in arbitration. After finding some common ground on which the belligerents agree, however slight, it is their duty laboriously and patiently to develop a formula which both sides will voluntarily accept as preferable to continuing the war. This procedure, which was followed in the Chaco war between Bolivia and Paraguay, is bound to result in a more enduring peace than could possibly follow a three-year war of bombing and starvation.

"The hopes now being expressed by benevolent liberals that a better and happier Europe can follow such a war do credit to their hearts but not their judgment. Three years of mutual destruction with all the weapons now available to man will not create the atmosphere of goodwill in which a lasting peace can be born.

"The period between now and March first, when, it is generally expected, the war will start in earnest, is probably our last opportunity to avert world ruin. The Germans are confident that they can win the war this Spring. The British and French are confident that they will win eventually. I am convinced that the neutrals can win a lasting peace if the President, Mussolini and the Pope cooperate wisely and boldly on lines of sincere mediation."

A sharp rejoinder comes from Dr. James T. Shotwell, Director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and a staunch advocate of the League of Nations:

Dr. James T. Shotwell

"Until the American people know what to do on their own account, they should not speak out boldly and forcibly to tell other nations what to do."

Not so discouraged is Robert J. Watt, international labor representative of the American Federation of Labor, who sees some hope for international order coming out of the present chaos:

Robert J. Watt

"Europe today is at war because the peoples of Europe allowed the germs of war to breed too long. To bring about peace by negotiation before those germs have run their horrible course is not possible of accomplishment by wishful thinking. It is a problem of political, economic and social science to isolate these germs and to determine the formula by which they can be overcome before the fever advances.

"We in the United States cannot be so cold as to ignore the suffering which exists or the far worse suffering which may lie ahead. Neither can we safely ignore the danger that the infection may spread.

"I wholeheartedly endorse President Roosevelt's references in his annual message to Congress. His leadership has already made our nation an influence for peace. Pope Pius XII has, in reply to the President's memorable message on Christmas Eve, expressed some postulates for peace which represent the most realistic diagnosis and general formula which has yet been advanced.

"I believe we can serve no good purpose merely to mediate between those who would rule or destroy and those who forsook peace only to defend the hearthstone of civilization.

"We must first explore the possibilities and propose a formula which is both realistic and endurable. We cannot find that formula by smug expressions of virtue or retreat into isolation. We must think actively and aloud. We must sell plans to the conscience and self-interest of the peoples involved.

"I firmly believe we must break from tradition in finding a peace which can live under modern conditions. International order must be the foundation for justice within and among nations.

"We cannot export a plan for peace without supporting a responsibility to share in the maintenance of that peace."

Another practical note is struck by the veteran radio commentator and lecturer:

H. V. Kaltenborn

"Two things must primarily concern the United States in connection with war and peace in Europe. The first is our own desire and determination to remain at peace. The second is the maintenance of that national

"Should the United States mediate in Europe?" Press and radio reports are pessimistic about a negotiated peace in 1940. Statements from belligerents are increasingly foreboding and observers agree that total war may break out on land, sea and in the air by March. As a reader of CURRENT HISTORY, "What's YOUR Opinion? See how you would answer the following suggestions before *you read the opinions of the experts, then after. If you feel like it, then write us YOUR opinion for a feature of this department.*

1. Can we, as a nation, do anything short of war, to stop the war in Europe now? ....
2. Should the United States government speak boldly and forcibly now in a final attempt to stop the conflict? ....
3. Do you believe our government and our people have done all they can to prevent the final outbreak of a large scale war? ....
4. Do you feel that we should remain entirely aloof from the conflict and let Europe settle it? ....
5. Is there evidence to indicate that the European nations will strive for a just peace after this war? ....
6. Do you think we can "isolate" ourselves from a major European conflict? ....
7. Do you think the belligerents would welcome a mediation offer from this country? ....
8. Do you think European neutrals would welcome a mediation offer from this country? ....
9. Do you think our government should have a part in making peace following this war? ....
10. Do you think our government should take part in guaranteeing a peace in Europe, if it were found to be generally considered a just peace by the American people? ....

unity which is essential to sound national decision. This means that we must exercise extreme care not to become a military participant in the European war. It also means that neither the Administration nor Congress must do anything in relation to Europe's war that would result in an important, enduring division of public opinion at home.

"I believe the United States can and should intervene in Europe, but I also believe that this intervention must be most carefully timed and must, to be effective, carry with it the bulk of American opinion. Those who, like myself, realize that the United States cannot practice isolation and remain a world power have previously made the mistake of defying or neglecting isolationist sentiment at home.

"We must not repeat Woodrow Wilson's tragic mistake in the post-World War era. We must prepare American public opinion rather than affront it. We must make it clear to our people that peace in Europe helps us politically and economically, that to shorten the war decreases the danger of our becoming involved in war, that the financial and economic recovery of Europe means the financial and economic recovery of the United States. We must talk less about preventing disaster in Europe and talk more about preventing disaster in the United States. We must show that, in our integrated world, triumphant force cannot be restricted to a single continent.

"We who believe in some sort of closer union among the nations of the world have never taken enough trouble to bring home to our own people the immediate practical advantages of integration. We have talked about moral disarmament, about the blessings of peace, about the horrors of war. We have not talked enough about our own practical gain in a world that reduces armaments, eliminates trade barriers and arbitrates differences."

This view regarding the need of an intelligent public opinion in the United States is dramatically seconded by the distinguished editor of The Emporia Gazette, *of Emporia, Kansas:*

William Allen White

"I feel that above everything we should keep out of this war, first because we should maintain our economic integrity so far as possible; and second, because we should keep our political neutrality so far as possible, not to save our own hide but to have some influence in directing or helping to direct the settlement of a just peace. If we are a belligerent, weakened economically and biased politically with the others, our voice will not have behind it the power that we will have if we remain economically strong and politically fairly neutral.

"I don't believe that any plan, any

George V. Denny, Jr.

specific course thought out in advance, any formula of any kind will keep us out of war. Only the sturdy resolution of the American people to avoid the conflict will keep us out of war. Moreover, we perhaps should be implemented by an intelligent citizenship not swept off its feet by emotions. That's the rub! Are we up to it? I don't know."

The Catholic Association for International Peace, speaking through its Acting Executive Secretary, Rev. R. A. McGowan, suggests "a congress of neutrals":

Rev. R. A. McGowan

"Certainly the United States should be ready to propose peace terms whenever there is hope of their acceptance. Europe needs an outside mediator. No single country can be the peace-maker in Europe so well as the United States.

"The United States should lead a congress of neutrals so as to bring still greater weight and pressure upon the warring countries at the moment when peace is possible. Even a constant conference of the ambassadors of neutrals will probably learn the best time to propose the best terms of peace and back them up better.

"Such a congress of neutrals will also prepare the way better for American participation in the guarantee of the rights of nations, the disarmament, the world organization, the guarantee of the rights of peoples and the reign of justice and charity—the points of the Papal peace program of Christmas '39—which must follow this war if it is not to be, simply, the second step in the suicide of Europe. Europe's suicide would be so tragic a calamity in itself and for us and the world that we must do everything within reason to prevent it."

The thought that, in some degree, the United States is responsible for the war is advanced by Quincy Wright, Professor of International Law at the University of Chicago:

Quincy Wright

"I think the United States has a considerable measure of responsibility for the war, particularly because of the inability of the American people to perceive that the protectionist and isolationist policies followed during the 1920's were incompatible with peace in the present situation of the world. Little more than temporary truces can be expected in Europe until the governments are prepared to limit their economic and military sovereignty and join some form of European union.

"I do not think such an achievement will be possible until the attitudes of certain of those governments have changed greatly from what they are today, and until the people of the United States are prepared to cooperate in some degree to maintain stability in the world and to assure that our vast economic resources and markets will not be regulated arbitrarily to prevent living opportunities for other people prepared to live peacefully, and will not be used to assist aggressors who violate fundamental principles of human solidarity.

"When opinion in the United States, in Germany, in France and in Britain has reached a sufficient degree of understanding of the reality of the world in which we live, of its economic, social and political interdependencies, there will then be an opportunity to mediate. I do not

believe that opinion, particularly in this country and in Germany, is such as to make any efforts successful at the present moment."

A man who is as close to the news of the world as anyone alive today is Elmer Davis, popular commentator of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who says:

Elmer Davis

"I believe our government and people have done all they could in recent years to 'prevent the final tragedy', whether a different policy just after the war would have helped much is a matter of guesswork now. I am increasingly inclined to doubt it, without a much deeper and more continuous involvement in European affairs than either Americans or Europeans would have liked.

"I don't think our moral weight is worth a damn as an instrument for stopping the war; nor is there the slightest prospect that any 'concrete proposals,' at present, would be acceptable to both sides."

"Stay neutral" is the primary theme of the reply by Congressman Harold Knutson of Minnesota:

Congressman Knutson

"The United States Government should use every legitimate influence at its command to bring about an early negotiated peace. If the war proceeds to a definite conclusion, which will take several years, it will leave the belligerent nations so weak that they will become easy prey to Communism. Europe's salvation lies in an early negotiated peace without victory.

"In common with millions of my fellow countrymen I am unalterably opposed, as I was back in 1917, to America's active participation in European squabbles and differences. Our forefathers came here to get away from those things and when they set out for America, the land of peace and opportunity, they rejected the idea of buying return transportation.

"For us to get into the war would be to again violate the best traditions of America. Based upon past experiences it would seem that we can make the greatest contribution to peace by remaining strictly neutral and at the same time let the world know that we are ready to step in as negotiators at the earliest feasible moment."

An eminent professor of international economic relations, Dr. Eugene Staley of Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Massachusetts, likewise suggests that we should stay out of the war and be in on the peace:

Dr. Eugene Staley

"My view is that the United States should hold itself in readiness to mediate in Europe whenever a situation arises that gives promise for achieving a really workable peace, which means one based on principles of human freedom and genuine cooperation among peoples for peaceful ends. I do not think this moment has arrived yet or is likely to arrive until the defeat of Hitler. In the meantime, it seems to me that the best thing for us to do is to continue as a neutral to make our policy support the Allied side as much as possible without involving ourselves directly, and to prepare for confronting the enormous issues that must arise at any future peace settlement.

"On the occasion of the last World War, we entered the War but ran out on the peace, abandoning the constructive work for world organization which might really have had a chance of making the world safe for democracy. This time I hope we may reverse the process. That is, we should try to stay out of the war but be in on the peace, and stay in permanently as leading exponents of some kind of a system of world organization, which is the prime essential of a lasting peace in this shrinking world."

Grave doubt that the warring nations would yield to the moral pressure of the United States is expressed by Congressman Roy O. Woodruff of Michigan:

Congressman Woodruff

"I have no idea whatsoever that, in the war between England and France on the one hand and Germany on the other, any of these belligerents will yield to the moral pressure of the United States unless that pressure were wrapped around a settlement which would enable each belligerent to reach its objectives.

"I hope I have no illusions about the situation, but believe no one of the three nations involved is alone responsible for the present conflict. Each is seeking to reach certain economic objectives and certainly no proposal that President Roosevelt could submit to them could promise a realization of the hopes of all three.

"To your question, 'Before the slaughter of millions begins—and the zero hour seems to be approaching—cannot a way be found for the United States to speak boldly and forcibly? Or do you feel that we should remain aloof from the conflict?' I reply that I believe we should remain aloof. When we repealed the Neutrality Act we deliberately placed one foot in the present war. Any further muddling or meddling on the part of this Administration will endanger the peace and the welfare of the American people."

And now let us hear the views of five peace societies, as expressed through their officials: Frank Olmstead, Chairman of the War Resisters League; Henry A. Atkinson, General Secretary of the Church Peace Union; Dorothy Detzer, Executive Secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Estelle M. Sternberger, Executive Director of World Peaceways, Inc., and John Nevin Sayre, Chairman of The Fellowship of Reconciliation:

Frank Olmstead

"The United States should at once offer to Europe a plan for peace which would appeal to the populations of the involved countries as unbiased and informed. To do this, our administration must regain a position of neutrality. It must, though it hurt emotionally, politically and economically, abandon its partisan policy based on a virtuous England and a vicious Germany. It must cease using gallant Finland to strike at a Russia held uniquely guilty for turning imperialistic. We must see the relationships between all nations as basicly wrong and war as a hopeless method of correcting them.

(Continued on page 58)

What American Democracy Means to Me

Foreword

THE following is the essay which won first prize in the Youth Division of Town Hall's Essay Contest on the subject, "What Does American Democracy Mean to Me?". A total of 5079 youths, seventeen years of age or less, participated in this Contest, representing every state in the union and several foreign countries.

This first-prize winner is Frank W. Kerr of 411 Thirty-first Street South, Seattle, Washington. He is a senior in Garfield High School. He will receive $500 in cash and a free trip to New York to appear on the program of "America's Town Meeting of the Air."

In addition to the first prize, there are also a second prize of $200, a third prize of $100 and twenty additional $10 prizes.

The money for prizes in the Youth Division was donated by Mr. and Mrs. Walter E. Myer of Washington, D. C.

In the Adult Division of this same Essay Contest, more than 7000 essays were submitted. The essay winning first prize in the Adult Division will be printed in the March issue of CURRENT HISTORY. Prize money for winners in the Adult Division was donated by Mrs. Henry Morgenthau, Sr.

OUR street is a fine kind of a street. First of all, on the 27th Avenue corner is Tony's shoe repair. Tony fixes shoes for nearly everyone in our neighborhood. Then, next to Tony's, is Peterson's. Pete keeps a first-class Smörgasbörd where we get nickel pies and cakes after school. Next to Pete's is Mr. Cohen's. He rents the back of his shop to Mrs. Fugiko who does laundry for thirty cents a bundle. Safeway Grocery takes up the rest of the block down to 26th. Jay works there. He says maybe he can get me on in the Christmas rush. At the very corner, on the curbing, old Mose has his paper shack. My Dad always buys his evening papers there.

Yes, our street is a fine kind of street. Tony says you won't find one like it anywhere but in American cities. And Tony knows. He's been around. It's not so much the different kinds of people working and living on our street that makes it fine, Tony says. It's more the way they get along together; making little sacrifices for each other; getting their wives and children together in the evening for games and gossip and eating; trusting each other with a brother's trust.

So when I pass down our street I feel proud. You see, it won't be long until I'll be out looking for a place to start my business. I'd like to build on a street as fine as ours . . .

I'm seventeen. In six months I'll be out of school and on my own. I've always thought of earning my living as something far away, unreal. Now that it's upon me I'm not sure just what to think. But I do know one thing, a thing so big that little everyday qualms and fears of life dissolve and leave me feeling strong and glad: I know that there are streets on which men live, that hold out fine clean hands and say, "Welcome. Here is life. Share it with us."

As long as there is this to pat me on the back I can go forward with a will to live. And I will make my house on a fine street . . .

I've read that there are lands where living is not art, but science. The people are machines that turn out life by the pound. The rote that children learn is measured by the pound. When their faces become square and their bodies riveted, they cease their learning and begin production. The woman's task is clear. Her yield is easily measured by the pound. "Wife, make not the mistake of bearing me a weightless child. I need eight pounds to meet my quota." The man's task is also clear. His yield is greater than woman's, though upon the woman's face the stamp of success first shows itself. "Man, let your labor yield ten times one-hundred pounds, else prison bars will keep you in."—"Old woman, yield five and fifty pounds, else you can have no rest, no peace . . ."

I have heard of lands like this, where speech is but the archive of the dead who longed for life; where friendship is but the guise of enmity; where young men pass examinations in killing and gain scholarships for honorable work in the field of brotherly hate. I have read these things, yet it is hard to believe that a normal boy can scorn to laugh, can clog the passage through which joy must pass from where the heart should be . . .

When I first started to think on this subject of Democracy, the day when I passed down our street and looked at what I had not seen before, that day I asked a question as I passed. "Tony," I said (and to each other one, I said), "tell me, what does American Democracy mean to you?" And each one gave to me, in different words, the one true answer. From his own heart he said the words that made the earth seem beautiful, the people glad, their God good. And when I'd mulled those words over to myself, pulling—pushing, pounding—tapping, testing each one with my own, I came to see that those two words "American Democracy" formed but a supercilious mask, trying in vain to hide the simple meaning—"live, and let live."

I HAVE said that there are places where, in exchange for youth, a boy receives a book of lessons out of which he learns the art of balancing what he will call his life upon the tip of his bayonet. I wonder how a boy would face his coming years, if all he'd learned in youth was lore of might and strength and hate of weaker men. I wonder with what heart he'd face a world of steel and blood and caustic words. I wonder how a boy, so young, could take this destiny into his hands and hold it high to marvel and to love.

And when I'd wondered on these things, I realized that any man can live his life when there is love or pride or faith to hearten him. But when the future holds a piece of steel, a dozen bolts out to a man and says, "This is your life. Now make the most of it," then what is man to do but gird himself in bitterness, and in his desperation take into his hands the future of his fellow man, and knot and twist and break it until the sum of what is left is measureless . . .

And so I say, to me "American Democracy" means that I can build my home upon a street where love and brotherhood have hung their welcome sign for me to see, where I may live, and in my living give to other lives the selfsame urge to live.

THEY SAY
Quotations from the World Press

Mr. Miller Reports on Your Congressman

—Condensed from a column by Harlan Miller in The Washington Post

Here are some of the distinctions of certain members of the House of Representatives:

Most fluent at French and flowery lingo: Mouton of Louisiana . . . Best White House strategy—makes FDR listen: Ellis of Arkansas . . . Least likely to be stampeded: Costello of California—he once voted against the whole House and turned out to be right; later the House reversed itself . . . Sloppiest thinker in the House: Thorkelson of Montana . . . Most nervous about leap year: Hennings, of Missouri . . . Excites most motherly cries in the gallery: twenty-six-year-old Beckworth of Texas . . . Best cowhand: Ferguson of Oklahoma—or is it Kleberg of Texas? . . . Fathers of five children who excite most rapture in the galleries: Kean of New Jersey and Byron of Maryland . . . Handsomest Irishman in the estimation of the female House attachés—this ought to start a fight: Casey of Massachusetts . . . Most glamorous war vet—wounded while a prisoner of war in Germany: Izac of California . . . Only member who flies a plane regularly: Maas of Minnesota . . . Only member who bears his mother's name: Thomas of New Jersey. (He had it legally changed.) . . . Only bearded member who ever circled the globe with one small valise: Tinkham of Massachusetts . . . Best Biblical authority: Barton of New York . . . Only member ousted from last Congress and back in triumph: Jenks of New Hampshire . . . Only member who has attended English, French and German universities: Short of Missouri . . . Only member whose dad was Speaker: Byrns of Tennessee . . . Occupant of Abe Lincoln's seat: Barnes of Illinois . . . Best actor in the House, who comes by it naturally as Tallulah Bankhead's father: Speaker Bankhead . . . Punchiest orator for his weight: Halleck of Indiana . . . Only all-American football player who ever flew in Goering's plane: Fish of New York . . . Fieriest Southerner (must be relative of the "Gone With the Wind" O'Hara): Cox of Georgia . . . Only Notre Dame guard (played with the Four Horsemen): Harrington of Iowa.

Mr. Diggs Goes to Town

—From The Baltimore Evening Sun

At the hearings against the magazine *Good Housekeeping* which were held in New York City recently, the trial examiner of the Federal Trade Commission, Charles F. Diggs, who sat at the head of a long table solemnly listening to testimony, was seen to make copious notes on a pad. An editor of *Tide*, an advertising magazine, was very curious to know the nature of these notes; and when Mr. Diggs casually threw several sheets of them into a waste basket, he hung around a while and fished them out. One of them, reproduced in *Tide*, is reproduced again below:

A Kansas Sage on Spinach

—From The Emporia Gazette

What with a couple of wars in other parts of the world, depression and unemployment at home, civilization continues to march on. The most important advance since the abolition of hoops and bustles was disclosed recently in the modest announcement of Massachusetts Institute of Technology research workers, who not only gave the lie to spinach, but foreshadowed its decline and fall. Spinach, they discovered, contains only .5 parts per 100,000 of iron—a "very poor rating by comparison with molasses, beef liver and oatmeal."

So this vile and bitter weed, forced down the protesting throats for generations by well-meaning but scientifically uninformed mothers, will probably be reduced to hog feed, which is what it deserves. And we can look forward to a new generation, uncursed by the green leaf, smiling and happy in its iron content, obtained, we hope, from doses of molasses, beef liver or oatmeal. *Sic transit!*

It's Still the Old Decade

—From an editorial in The New York Times

A vendor of New Year's cheer invites the public "to start the forties with a bang." This is too good an occasion for debate to overlook an occasion which comes only once every ten years, with a grand windup once a century.

It is superficially correct to say that the year 1940 starts off the forties. The new year has the "40" combination in it. But the year 1940 does not start off a new decade. It is the final year in the old decade. If the year 1940 should produce the finest book or play or picture in ten years, the masterpiece must be credited, oddly enough, to the thirties.

This is, of course, the ancient quarrel about when the present century began. It did not begin on January 1, 1900, which was the last year in the nineteenth century. It began on Jan-

uary 1, 1901. If a person goes in for stacking copper pennies in piles of ten, then penny No. 10 will be the last coin in the first pile and not the first coin in the second pile. Penny No. 40 will be the last coin in the fourth pile and not the first coin in the fifth pile.

Babson on 1940

—From an article by Roger Babson in The Washington Post

No forecast on the war or its duration is possible at this time. It may be all over tomorrow, or it may drag on for years. The important point right now is to recognize that war's effect on business is being overemphasized. So far, it has neither helped nor hurt American business. When, and if, fighting breaks out in earnest, Allied war orders will help our business. But under no circumstances would the belligerents buy as much from us as they did in 1915–17. The war is in no sense the major prop under our current boomlet. That's why I say, "War or peace, early 1940 will see the best business in ten years."

The first half of 1940 will come the closest to "good times" that we have seen since 1929. Readers must not think, however, that I believe everything is hunky-dory. Real prosperity is as far away as ever. Real prosperity is merely a synonym for progress of civilization. With millions of men jobless at home and millions more trying to kill each other abroad, real prosperity is not even "just around the corner." Real prosperity and lasting peace will return only when the desires and goals of our and all other peoples change—that is when we all practice what Jesus taught 2,000 years ago.

A Creed for 1940

—From a column by H. I. Phillips in The New York Sun

I believe in the United States of America, in trouble or out of trouble, in war or in peace.

I believe in the future of its institutions despite the snipers, underminers, termites, life savers and apostles of doom.

I believe there are still great frontiers offering unlimited opportunities and that the main trouble is all the trails leading to them are held by scalping parties.

I believe the kidney punch should be barred in government as well as in boxing.

Glasgow Record

The German radio announcer works himself into a rage.

I believe in the democratic form of government, but I do not believe in the form of all Democrats in charge of it.

I believe in an occasional good word for diligence and thrift.

I believe that the industrial leaders of this country are, in the great bulk, at least as square, honorable, well-meaning and kindly as any other group and that impulse for impulse, heart-beat for heart-beat and mood for mood, they are as dependable in the pinches as the reformers, agitators and fix-it-alls.

I believe the best thing that could happen to America would be for some government official, somewhere, sometime, to greet a businessman without a sneer and allow newsreel pictures of the strange spectacle to be circulated.

I believe the depression would have been ancient history if the amateur economists, rainbow painters, theorists, soothsayers and first-aid specialists had developed fallen arches earlier in their mad dashes hither and thither.

I believe in budgets, double-entry ledgers, plain arithmetic, old-fashioned auditors and in the old adage: "Nobody has all the right answers all the time . . ."

"Silent Phones"

—From a Washington column by Ray Tucker, distributed by the McClure Syndicate, as printed in Greenwich Time, *Greenwich, Connecticut*

Perhaps no telephone company in the United States has more "silent phones" on its list than that at Washington. A "silent phone" is one which cannot be rung except on permission of the owner. Every fifth-rate official at the Capital, figuring that possession of such a privilege helps to denote his rank, wants one as soon as he is sworn in.

The phones of President Roosevelt and Mrs. Roosevelt are not the most difficult to ring up. F. D. R. can be reached through Steve Early or Marguerite LeHand if the message is urgent enough, and you don't have to be a Cabinet member or a diplomat to talk with him. Malvina Thompson or Mrs. James Helm—her personal and social secretaries—may or may not put you in touch with the First Lady. She, too, is gracious in answering random callers.

The two personages most frequently wanted on the "silent phone" happen to be Mrs. Woodrow Wilson and Mary Roberts Rinehart, the novelist. People want Mrs. Wilson to ask her to speak before their clubs or to obtain contributions for their pet causes.

Is War an Act of God?

—From an article in The Christian Advocate

"War is an act of God. It means the end of thousands upon thousands who face it just as bravely as do hundreds of thousands who die every year of epidemics at home."—David Lawrence in *The United States News.*

The distinguished editor of the valuable periodical published at the Nation's capital is so often right that one hesitates to differ with him. But he is surely wrong this time. War is not an act of God; it is unthinkable that a Father who loves and pities His children should set them bombing each other's cities and sending each other's ships to the bottom of the ocean. . . .

It may be objected, however, that Mr. Lawrence was using the phrase "act of God" in its legal sense, meaning "such an extraordinary interruption of the usual course of events that no experience, foresight, or care which might reasonably have been expected could have foreseen or guarded against it."

But that is our trouble. In our thought we have limited acts of God to the inexplicable, the unpredictable, the calamitous. The earthquake is an act of God. The tidal wave is an act of God. The influenza epidemic is an act of God. And by the same reasoning, according to Mr. Lawrence, a war is an act of God for most people.

To make such a characterization is to misunderstand the natures of both God and man. As the creator and sustainer of the universe, God performs many acts that man cannot understand (and the Northern Lights are about as hard to understand as an earthquake or typhoon), but His purpose is to help, not to injure, man.

Likewise, man shares in some of the acts of God . . . according to the methods that God has established, and for the purposes that God has ordained. Only when man cooperates with God on God's terms, not man's, is he a worker together with God.

Spihk Dschormen?

—From an editorial in The Baltimore Sun

What the Nazis may be up to next, there's no telling. We have heard no reports as yet that they are planning to invade England; but recently we chanced upon a bit of phonetic English from an old handbook prepared by the Germans during the last World War for the use of their troops for the invasion of England that never came off. The first thing a German officer was to do, upon landing in England, was to arrest the first person he met and ask him:

"Du juh spihk dschormen?"

That is, obviously, "Do you speak German?" The questioner's next move—assuming that the Englishman no spihk—was to thumb through the booklet and find a suitable phrase, such as:

"Juh ahr a spai. If juh trai to rön aweh juh will bih schott."

It may be necessary to point out that the German j is equivalent to the English y, so that what the startled Englishman would hear would be something like this: "You ahr a spay (spy). If yuh tray to run avay, yuh'll be shot." A nice combination of South'n (or 'possum) dialect and Brooklynese. The questioning German continues:

"Köm nihrer. Kihp sailenze. Wott isz juhr nehm? Wott ahr juh duink szahr? Empti juhr pockets. Juh aur pörsönalli raszponsibel."

Do you begin to get it? If you do, O. K., let's see what the invader calls for when he begins to requisition (rekwisischen) supplies for his troops. He wants twenti oksen, fohr höndred piks, faif höndred kworts off milk; not to mention such tasty wiktjuals as behken, flaur, harrings and szoszidsches.

Boston Hobby

—Reprinted from The Boston Evening Transcript

The Veteran Motor Car Club of America was born at an informal dinner last winter when a dozen or fifteen men got together to talk shop about a mutual hobby, which is the collection and faithful reconditioning of vintage automobiles. It now has more than eighty members, subscribing to this purpose: "To further the preservation of veteran cars, *i. e.*, cars manufactured prior to 1911, to act as authentic source of information thereupon and to provide competitive events for various classes of veteran cars, and social events for all members."

The fun is all in the last two clauses; the serious phase in the first two. Right now, all four are in high gear with the throttle wide open. Collecting of old cars by individual members has been going on for as much as ten years.

Bankers and young mechanics share this new hobby, because patience more than pocketbook governs purchase and reconditioning. True, a recent $10 purchase ran up a bill of $200 before it took the road. But that was over a period of nearly two years. The cars are not usually expensive to purchase, because they are, in effect, worthless as they stand. Yet when they are fixed up no price can be put on them; they are more often than not unique.

In eleven collections owned by club members there are nearly 300 cars, and most of the other fans own one or two. In size they run from the little Orient Buckboards made in Waltham to sell for $500, to a truly colossal Panhard, twin of one made for the Czar of Russia. Cars of presidents and kings, and humble two-seaters recently reclaimed from Vermont barns are included.

De Groene Amsterdammer

Between the Allies and Russia

Farmers vs. Budget

—Condensed from a Washington Column by Ludwell Denny in The New York World-Telegram

The Roosevelt budget probably will be wrecked by the farmers. How much the farm bloc in Congress will increase the Roosevelt deficit depends chiefly on how much it can grab from the huge defense estimates if any.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has just notified the President that it will fight for $807,000,000 for parity payments. That is $807,000,000 more than the budget provides. The farm lobby officers added that they would favor a special tax if necessary for this purpose. But the chances of such a tax are slim.

Congress may cut the President's demands for a much bigger navy and army. This is an unexpected development. A fortnight ago it was assumed that the defense increases would be passed with only the small so-called anti-militarist group objecting.

But the Democratic economy group and Senate Republicans are challenging the army-navy requests. They may succeed in reducing the $2,116,000,000 defense estimate.

The farm lobby increased the federal aid to agriculture from $156,000,000 in 1930 to $1,317,000,000 for 1940, or almost 750 per cent. The total increase in federal net expenditures in that decade was 172 per cent.

So under any circumstances the farm lobby can be depended on. Last year it overrode the President and

the Congressional economy bloc and got $225,000,000 for parity payments not in the budget.

Worst of all for the administration, perhaps, is the farmer's disappointment over the war market. He hoped that foreign orders would wipe out the surplus. Now comes the administration warning him that the European war in the long run probably will hurt American agriculture: that European countries have stored large reserves and that we have upward of 40,000,000 excess acres in production.

Why Not Try Christianity?

—Condensed from a letter by Brigadier General F. E. Burnham to The China Weekly Review, *Shanghai*

What is wrong with the Christian world? A cultured Mohammedan mufti was once asked what he thought of the Christian religion. He replied:—"It is a wonderful religion but it has never been tried." His reply has become a classic.

It is futile to say that all the blame is on one side. What Christian nation ever concerned itself about the millions which have been massacred since the war that was fought for liberty and self-determination of nations? Anyone who stands idly by, while his fellow beings are persecuted and massacred, is devoid of the most elementary of Christian principles.

Mussolini, who sits in the shadow of the Vatican, brought civilization and Christianity to Ethiopia in the form of cannon, high explosives, aerial bombs, poison gas, fire and tanks. The recent surrender to Japanese assassins at Tientsin of four unfortunate Chinese, whose only crime was that they fought for their country, is a deplorable incident in an utterly selfish world.

An indelible memory abounding in gratitude is the friendliness to the writer of a Mohammedan merchant of the Balkans. His first advice was, "Keep away from women. When people come from your countries they start messing about with women, and lose the respect of the whole countryside."

If a poll were taken of Montenegro, Armenia, Cilicia, Ethiopia, Czecho-Slovakia, Albania and Palestine, which have suffered betrayal at the hands of so-called Christian nations, what would the verdict be?

The "Short" route from Los Angeles to Buenos Aires.

Driving Down to Argentina

—From an article in The Emporia Gazette, *Kansas*

The first American to drive an automobile from the United States southward over the Pan-American highway route to Argentina recommends that tourists wait at least two decades before trying the trip.

Ellis K. Short, thirty, a Los Angeles law school graduate who got to Buenos Aires in a $70 automobile, reconditioned for $280, says the 14,500 miles covered since he left California February 4, 1939, were the most difficult he ever hopes to see.

"It is not the wild Indians or the dangerous animals. I didn't see a single one of either," Short says. "But driving without roads and under such weather conditions is too much for the health of most individuals."

Several Latin Americans have made the northern trip from Buenos Aires to the United States—one party tearing down their car and transporting it on mule-back over some sections of the proposed route. From the north two Argentines and a German have ridden motorcycles through Central America to the southern continent. But Short says he is the first person to make the trip by automobile from north to south.

From California Short drove steadily southward through Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, passing through sections which even the Pan-American Union —sponsors of the highway—told him were impassable.

In Nicaragua he encountered a roadless, trailless jungle through which he could pass only with the aid of an ox team and a crew of natives to cut a way. "In that area I had my worst day's travel—six miles," the Californian says. "From Nicaragua into Costa Rica it took me five days to make forty miles, much of it along horse trails or no trails at all."

With his gasoline consumption, on hard stretches, as little as three miles a gallon, gasoline supply became a big problem for roadside stations are virtually unknown in many sections of the area he traveled.

Short reached Valparaiso August 27. The bottom of his roadster shone like a polished steel mirror from the heavy brushing of undergrowth.

He estimated the trip cost him about $2,000. He paid 15 cents a gallon for gasoline in Ecuador and Mexico, 50 cents in Honduras, where motor fuel was available only in five gallon tins. His fuel mileage for the 14,500-mile drive was between ten and eleven miles to the gallon.

Mechanics who overhauled Short's car in Buenos Aires said it was in good condition with a single exception. Constant jarring on the rough trails and roads shook off his front license plate once, and it was nearly worn through a second time.

Short saw not a single snake on the whole trip, despite the stories he heard of reptiles in the tropical jungles. Animals were few and far between.

"The most savage things I ran into were the bees," he said. "Twice we had to spend hours cutting a trail around a swarm. And in the tropics the natives frequently warned me of one type which caused blindness if it stung a person's eyes."

Finland's Man of the Hour: Mannerheim

—From an article by Edmund Stevens in The Christian Science Monitor

Field Marshal Baron Gustav Charles Emil Mannerheim, the man who is hailed as the savior and national hero of the new democratic Finland, is an aristocrat of the old school. But this implies no contradiction, for by a happy faculty he combines the best traditions of the past with the enlightenment of the present. This son of an old Swedish-Finnish family served in the imperial Russian army for thirty years. He commanded the Tsar's bodyguard and later rose to the rank of major-general.

Field Marshal Mannerheim is a man of wide interests and accomplishments—scholar, soldier, statesman, social reformer, and sportsman; but, unlike so many of his class, there is nothing of the dilettante about him. His treatises on Chinese Turkestan and the people of Central Asia, which have been translated into several languages, are the works of an authority on natural science. As a social reformer he has organized and supported from his personal means one of the most splendid systems of child welfare in Europe. As a sportsman he has hunted tigers in India. He goes riding every morning at 7:30 sharp.

At seventy-two he retains a stalwart carriage that belies the conventional record of his years. He rides his horse like a veteran cavalryman. Handsome, distinguished looking, and 6 feet 2 inches tall, Field Marshal Mannerheim has always maintained that the secret of success in life was to be impressive and fascinating.

Baron Mannerheim likes brilliant society. During his frequent visits to England, where his two grown daughters live, he is a frequent guest at Claridge's. He is persona grata among the horsy and hunting sets of English aristocracy. After Russia's collapse in 1917, Baron Mannerheim, one of the few generals of outstanding ability in the Russian army, set forth for Finland in his private motorcar from Transylvania, where he had commanded the Sixth Cavalry Corps. Russia was in the throes of a violent revolution. Generals were being shot like flies, but Baron Mannerheim's courage and resourcefulness won through and he reached Finland without mishap.

At the beginning of 1918 it was Mannerheim's organizing genius that quickly built up a Finnish army from the nuclei of an undisciplined civil guard, and who planned and carried out plans whereby this army, with German support, broke the power of the Russian Government in Helsinki and drove Finnish and Russian Reds out of Finland. After this combat, Baron Mannerheim went to live in retirement.

Soon, however, the young Finnish state, having won its freedom from Russia with German aid, was in danger of sharing the fate of the vanquished at the hands of the victorious Allies at the close of the World War. Summoned from retirement, Mannerheim was charged with the difficult commission of obtaining better relations with England and France. During his visits to London and Paris, Baron Mannerheim's skill as a diplomat proved equal to his ability on the battlefield. He brought back diplomatic recognition from both England and France and permission to purchase grain, thereby saving his country from threat of famine.

In the spring of 1919 Mannerheim resigned his post as Regent of Finland, following the election of Stahlberg as the first President of the Finnish Republic under a new constitution. For the next 12 years Baron Mannerheim refrained from political life, devoting himself to works of philanthropy and social reform. But in 1931 he was called upon to head the newly formed Supreme Council.

In this capacity the man who had formed the Finnish army proceeded to reorganize and re-equip it, transforming it into a first-class modern fighting force. Now that Finland has again been attacked by her huge Soviet neighbor, Mannerheim is again the man of the hour. He is commander in chief of the forces defending the homeland.

Illustrated, London

"You can't do it, silly."

Finland's War Dogs

Translated from Hufvudstadsbladet, *a daily, of Helsinki, Finland*

Not only was Finland's manpower called to arms when the military situation became threatening; the four-legged reservists—horses and dogs—also had to report for service. It may surprise many readers to learn that there are such things as War Dog Reservists. However, the members of Finland's Service Dogs Association have now put their canine friends at the disposal of the fatherland.

A few days ago we paid a visit to the War Dogs School where these reservists are trained for service. With the head of the school, Army Captain Degerstedt, we inspected the drilling ground where the dogs were hard at work, learning to run in relays. The dogs are sent from one post to another. While they are doing this, they have to cross a section of the field where soldiers fire salvos, explode small bombs, and make loud noises with rattles. The dogs learn to make their way from post to post paying

no attention to noises around them.

"An army has many uses for these dogs," said Captain Degerstedt while we watched the training. "We distinguish between messenger dogs, dogs for medical service, dogs for patrol service, watch dogs, and dogs for pulling vehicles. The last named group is used up in the north, where they perform mighty good service. The watch dogs are used for guarding important depots, bridges and railroad stations. They do this either with soldiers, or, within enclosed grounds, all by themselves. These dogs are extremely watchful and reliable. It is not at all pleasant for unauthorized persons to become acquainted with them.

"The patrol dogs are the reliable comrades of our frontier guards and aid them in their difficult task. The dogs which are detailed to the medical service are taught to look for the wounded on the battlefield. The most important task of the messenger dogs is to convey reports and military maps. However, they can also be used for carrying medicine and ammunition to outposts or pulling telephone wires to exposed positions.

"As the messenger dogs do duty at the very front lines, one of the most important drills is to teach them to run in relays. A messenger dog must have only one thought, to get through to *his* soldier, notwithstanding the terrific noise of the battlefield. The entire training aims at teaching the dog to be devoted to his protector—the soldier to whom he has been detailed.

"A so-called team consists of a leader and two soldiers, the latter accompanied by their messenger dogs. Out of devotion to their masters the two dogs willingly run to and fro between the outposts held by these two soldiers. They perform their duty regardless of weather and wind, darkness or light.

"The distance which the dogs have to cover is usually less than five kilometers, but with good dogs we have succeeded in extending the distance up to about twenty-five kilometers. The messenger dogs usually cover a kilometer in three to five minutes. But this fellow here, if he feels like it, takes only one minute"—the Captain pointed at a black police dog which whined with excitement, waiting for the moment when he would be unchained.

"If the dog has to wear a gasmask, his speed is greatly lessened; he may even be slower than his own master," continued the Captain.

"How much time does it take to make a reliable messenger out of a dog?"

"That depends, of course, upon the dog. But in general the training takes about a month. One has to be very careful and extend the scope of duty only gradually. The whip is never used, although the discipline is very strict. The dog must be made to feel at all times that he must follow his master's orders and not his own inclinations. Great care must also be taken to train a dog so that he is never afraid of the sound of gunfire. A dog which shows fright is usually unfit for further training. In general, the animals very quickly learn to like their work and are eager to start on their run as soon as the case, containing the report sheet, has been fastened to their collar. They are extremely obedient and once broken in are not likely to forget their sense of duty.

"Like the soldiers, the dogs, while in service, have to follow a certain schedule. They have to get up at a certain hour, they are cleaned twice daily, they have field training, night drills, and so on. They are fed twice daily, and they are trained to take their own bowls to the cook house. When they are in camp, every dog has a little tent, into which he can creep at night.

"If the dog's master is gifted with patience, calmness, and willpower—and only such people are suited for this service—the dog will serve him with unlimited devotion. He will be faithful unto death."

London Herald

Hitler: "Believe me, Rib., that Stalin's crazy. He thinks he's Napoleon!"

Nazis to Invade England?

—*Condensed from an article by the Berlin correspondent of* Svenska Dagbladet, *a daily, of Stockholm*

"As soon as the right moment arrives, we are going to tackle the English," an authoritative German spokesman recently declared to the *Svenska Dagbladet* correspondent. He added that the attack will come soon. He did not discuss the extent to which German terror may be carried, but was convinced the attack was inevitable.

"We have time to wait, but we are not going to wait for two years. This time we are going to administer a decisive blow, and it will be such a serious affair that it would be irresponsible if we were to act hastily."

There has been talk in Berlin for some time that Germany intends to land troops on British soil at an opportune moment. Such a plan may, at first, seem fantastic, as it is possible only if Germany is undisputed master of the North Sea. Although one listens to such reports with skepticism, a number of signs indicate that German strategists have something of that kind in mind. It is interesting to note that this idea has now been taken up by the German press.

An article in the Berlin paper *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* states that there is no divine law which forbids an enemy to land on the "chosen people's" island; that a change in the situation in the near future may increase the chances of an invasion; that a war is not won by following obsolete rules, but by displaying imagination and courage; and that

if Britain intends to force Germany to fight this war to the bitter end, it will, for the first time in nine hundred years, experience the horrors of war on its own soil.

This article has been read with great interest in Berlin. It reminds one of Hitler's slogan that "there are no more islands." In this connection it is of interest to point to the fact that Germany did not attempt to molest the transportation of British troops to France. Germany was not interested in preventing such transport.

If Germany ever should threaten Britain seriously with invasion of its territory, Britain would have to face a highly disagreeable situation. It would have to station many war vessels along its North Sea coast, it would have to be constantly on the alert against German submarine and airplane attacks, its convoy service would be weakened, and its trade would thereby be exposed to increased risks.

Although Germany pretends not to know where the British fleet is stationed, it is well aware that the fleet is not in the North Sea. Perhaps the article in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* is an initial attempt to coax the British fleet into dangerous waters. The hints contained in the article are so obvious that it could not have been published without the express consent of some high authority.

Hitler as Wotan

—Condensed from a copyrighted dispatch sent from London to the New York Herald-Tribune *by Tania Long*

The veil of official secrecy which covered the dramatic visit of Andre Francois-Poncet, once French Ambassador at Berlin and now Ambassador at Rome, to Fuehrer Adolf Hitler on Oct. 18, 1938, in Der Fuehrer's eagle's nest retreat high atop a Bavarian Alp has now been lifted with the publication of a French "yellow book."

In this French version of the events which led up to the war, the one foreign diplomat for whom the German Chancellor had shown a marked liking—the one foreigner, in fact, who was said to be able to handle Hitler—gives a detailed description of the fantastic pavilion where Der Fuehrer, in solitary retirement, communes with his Teutonic gods.

Francois-Poncet was the first foreigner ever to cross the machine-gun-guarded threshold to Hitler's mountain eyrie. The fact that Hitler received him there was in itself a mark of high esteem; few Germans, even, beyond those of his immediate entourage, had been honored by being let into the secret of their leader's solitary hide-out.

The French diplomat's report of his pilgrimage to the mystic mountaintop reads like something out of "The Thousand and One Nights." Written with supreme command of the French language—full of poetic fancies and allusions—it is like few reports submitted by a diplomat to a European chancellery. The author skillfully conjures up for the reader the sensation of awe and wonder that assailed him as he first caught a glimpse from below of the eagle's nest perched in the sky.

"Hitler," Francois-Poncet said to a friend after the visit, "is playing at Wotan." (Wotan, or Woden, is one of the highest deities in the Germanic mythology; he was credited with a special skill in magic.)

Extracts of Francois-Poncet's report of Oct. 20, 1938, to Georges Bonnet, Minister for Foreign Affairs, for France, follow: "In inviting me on the evening of Oct. 17 to go to see him as soon as possible, Chancellor Hitler had placed at my disposal one of his private planes. I, therefore, left for Berchtesgaden by air next day in the company of Captain Stehlin. Arrived there, an automobile took me not to the Obersalzburg Villa, where Der Fuehrer lives and where he had already received me, but instead to an extraordinary spot where, when the weather is good, he loves to spend his days.

"Seen from afar, this place appears to be a sort of observation or hermitage, perched 1,900 meters (about 6,000 feet) on the crest of a ridge of rock. One arrives by a winding road about fifteen kilometers (eight miles) long, hewn boldly out of the stone, its daring construction paying tribute as much to the talent of the engineer Todt, as to the intensive labors of the workmen who, in three years, completed this gigantic task." [Fritz Todt worked on Germany's western fortifications.]

"The road ends at the entrance to a long tunnel, which thrusts into the earth; heavy, double brass doors guard the entrance. At the further end of this tunnel a large elevator with copper walls awaits the visitor. Rising up a vertical shaft of 110 meters cut out of rock, the elevator ascends to the level of the Chancellor's abode.

"Here one's surprise reaches its highest point. In effect, the visitor sees before him a squat and massive construction, consisting of a gallery of Roman pillars, an immense glassed-in, circular chamber with a vast chimney in which burn enormous logs of wood and a table surrounded by about thirty chairs, as well as of several side rooms furnished elegantly with comfortable arm chairs.

"On every side, looking through the bay windows, one's gaze, as from a high, speeding plane, passes into an immense panorama of mountains. In the distance, one sees Salzburg and its neighboring villages, above which rises, as far as the eye can see, a horizon of mountains and peaks and of pastures and forests which cling to their slopes.

"Close to the house, which appears to be suspended in the void, and almost hanging over it, an abrupt wall of naked rock rears itself. The whole, bathed in the glow of an autumn evening, is glamorous, wild, almost eerie.

"The visitor wonders whether he is awake or dreaming. He would like to know where he is. Is it the castle of Montsalvat, inhabited by the Knights of the Grail, a Mount Athos sheltering the meditations of a cenobite, or the Palace of Antinea, rearing itself in the heart of the Atlas?

"Is it a realization of one of those fantastic designs with which Victor Hugo used to decorate the margins of the manuscript of 'The Burgraves,' a millionaire's fantasy, or only a hideout where brigands take their

Marianne, Paris

"Well, if it isn't old filthy viper!"
"My dear scum of the earth!"

rest and accumulate their treasure?

"Is it the product of a normal mind, or that of a man tormented by delusions of grandeur, haunted by a desire for domination and solitude, or simply the prey of fear?

"One detail attracts attention and for those who seek to determine the psychology of Adolf Hitler it is of no less value than others: the roads of access, the entrance to the tunnel, the immediate surroundings of the house, all are organized along military lines and protected by nests of machine guns.

"The Chancellor welcomes me amiably and with courtesy. His face is pale and tired looking. He is not in one of his excitable moods; rather, he seems to be in a state of relaxation. At once he drags me towards the bay windows of a large room; he shows me the scenery; he enjoys the astonishment and admiration which I do not seek to hide. Then he expresses his regret at my approaching departure. We exchange some courtesies and phrases of politeness. At his command, tea is served in one of the side rooms, where he conducts me with M. von Ribbentrop [Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop] while the Nazis of his entourage remain separately in the other rooms. . . .

". . . For nearly two hours M. Hitler listens with good grace to my questions; he answers them without the least embarrassment, with simplicity and, in appearance at least, with frankness. But the moment has come to return him his freedom. The Castle of Antinea is now drowned in the shadows which fall upon the valleys and the mountains. I take my leave. Der Fuehrer hopes that I may some day return to Germany and visit him as a private person. He shakes my hand several times. At the exit of the elevator and of the tunnel I find a car which has been awaiting me; it takes me via Berchtesgaden to the airport, whence the plane carries me through the night to Berlin."

Star Weekly—Toronto, Canada

"What do I do now, instructor?"
"Crikey! I thought you were the instructor!"

Rumors in Scotland

—From an article in The National Review, *London*

Scotland is no more immune than other parts of the world from rumors, and besides hearing, like everyone else, of the capture of the *Bremen*, the sinking of the *Deutschland*, the death of Hess, the birth of Miss Goering, and the surrender of German seaplanes in Holland, we even have some of our own. A particularly good one was that the lighthouse keeper on an East of Scotland island had been arrested, "*and* since then there have been no German raids." This is the operative use of the word "and," as in Mr. Belloc's classic example that "all those apprehended for speaking disrespectfully of the Grand Mufti should be brought into his presence *and* decapitated." It is the word "and" which makes all the difference.

Hardly less prolific than rumors are the stories of our native evacuees. One hostess, it is said, was surprised to find her small guests on the road with half a dozen cabbages. "See, missis," said one, "we fun' these things on the groon'. Ye only get them in the shoaps at hame." Unfamiliarity with country fauna rather than flora was responsible for another "true" tale. One kind lady sent her child evacuees for a country walk, and was distressed a few minutes later to find them still in the house, almost in tears. She asked what was the matter, and was astonished to receive the reply: "Please, we went into yon field, but we're feart o' the wee broon bears." No doubt a rabbit does look a little different with its skin on, but that story tests even a townsman's credulity too highly.

Not only true, but solemn fact, which will astonish no Scotsman, is the circumstance that Henry Cotton [former open golf champion of Britain and present champion of Germany], on his visit to Edinburgh, raised in each of his exhibition matches near Edinburgh and Glasgow respectively over twice as much for the Red Cross as in any of his English displays. His game at Garnton was visited, but not interrupted by one of the air raids. The local theory was that the Germans had come over to see their open champion play.

Neville's Horace

—Condensed from Time and Tide, *London*

Sir Horace Wilson is again in "the rumors". One can't say in the "news" because Sir Horace doesn't want to be, and newsmen have to respect the foibles of bigwigs these days. And such a bigwig! To the Labour Backbenches he is "that fellow from the Ministry of Labour who's got too big for his boots". It is the really influential or, more correctly, the ought-to-be-really-influential among the Government's supporters who are infuriated by his works and ways.

There are no "charges" against Sir Horace. No one doubts his utter probity in every sphere of life. But it is irritating, especially if you are a Really Important Person, very anxious to get a move on here, or have new schemes tried out there,—that along whichever avenue you are exploring, underneath each stone that you do not leave unturned, there somehow is Sir Horace. Sir Horace Wilson, not Sir Warren Fisher, is now head of the Treasury. Months ago most men who knew him would have bet substantially on Warren Fisher holding his own. Is there trouble in the Civil Service?—it is to Sir Horace Wilson that you must go, but you will not get satisfaction. The

Strube Cartoon

The War Institute, actively resumed after twenty years, greets the Class of 1940 with a lesson in the vocabulary of aggression.

women M.P.'s discover that the elaborate machinery for fairly staffing the new Ministers has not in fact been used. They descend in anger on the Ministers but the arrangements, they are assured, were Sir Horace Wilson's.

This for the lesser issues. But in the big political problems it is just the same. It is no use thinking you will get anywhere with the Prime Minister unless you have first fixed the approval of Wilson. Wilson attends Cabinet meetings. Those Cabinet Ministers who dislike and fear his influence are furious, but helpless. He is there on the P.M.'s invitation. He does not speak of course—not to the Cabinet. But a word in the Prime Minister's ear put at the appropriate moment. It is all so correct, so tactful, and so infuriating to Ministers who remember the advice Sir Horace Wilson has given on critical occasions.

Sir Horace Wilson's influence with the Prime Minister dates back to the time when as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Neville Chamberlain found himself "at sea" in Ottawa. The Colonial Premiers and their experts knew every figure, every detail of the trade and markets of their own countries. That was their job. The British Chancellor was fair game, the obvious target for their concentrated fire. The British delegation had its experts, but they were experts each in their own line. Then at his elbow the worried Mr. Chamberlain found a man who had assimilated all the figures, who knew the answers, and whose views on Empire coincided perfectly with his own. From that period, the Wilson influence with Mr. Neville Chamberlain has grown until now, even the merest hint of criticism in the House of Commons against this all-powerful adviser raises the restrained Prime Minister to fury. Mr. Chamberlain, to be sure, is an easy-going man and it is not characteristic of him to indulge in fits of temperament.

The Morning Paper—How to Enjoy It

—From The Bermudian, *a monthly, of Hamilton, Bermuda*

In company with many another we've long fretted about the paucity and unreliability of war news. What we read or hear over the wireless is either obvious propaganda or reports of tantalizing brevity thoroughly emasculated by the censors. In consequence, eating our breakfast, with the morning paper propped against the teapot, we've chafed so at the incomplete communiques that we've bolted our victuals and left for the office indignantly feeling we were being treated like an infant, and that with a first-class war on we have a right to look for some pretty rousing reading nowadays. Besides, we found that upon the war news depended our spiritual mood for the entire day. Bad news made us gloomy, good news evoked over-jubilance, no news left us moody and distrait. In any case, our appetite was affected, and instead of relishing our waffles we hungered for certainty and details.

But one day we had occasion to look up a reference to the last war, and promptly found ourselves engrossed for the next half-hour in the thrilling exploits of M. E. Nasmith, Commander of the British submarine *E-11*. His depredations among the enemy in the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmora in 1915 read like an Homeric saga. Our spirits were enormously bucked, our optimism ran high, our thirst for war news was fully slaked. That's what furnished the solution to our dilemma.

Now each morning, after scanning the scant war news in the paper, we turn to a volume of *History of the Great War, 1914-1918* and read a few pages of that. It works like a charm. When the paper announces, with aggravating inadequacy, Allied losses in the North Sea, shaking our confidence in Allied arms, we select the volume recounting the glorious details of the British naval raids on Ostende and Zeebrugge, or the annihilation of Von Spee's squadron in the Battle of the Falkland Islands. On the other hand, if the paper informs us of the destruction of a dozen German bombers by Allied aircraft and anti-aircraft units, making our ganglions quiver with elation, we regain a sober perspective by looking up the harrowing account of the retreat from Mons or the holocaust at Passchendaele.

The only drawback about this is that in conversation we are apt to get our two wars confused, and occasionally utter remarks like "Wonder how old Gort is handling the Verdun situation," "Foch will be busting through that Siegfried Line any day now," and "That *Lusitania* affair is Hitler's big mistake, you take my word. If Teddy Roosevelt were in the saddle the Yanks would be in it tomorrow." Of course, unfortunate lapses of this nature cause our friends to eye us peculiarly and mutter ill-manneredly among themselves.

The other day, our mind teeming with tidbits of information about this lusty, composite dream-war of ours, we inadvertently said: "See the French captured five thousand Boches on the Western Front." Somebody promptly demanded: "Where d'you get that?" We wriggled out of that one by murmuring: "From a usually reliable source."

"Propaganda," our friend snorted.

Notes and Documents

President Roosevelt

--Excerpts from President Roosevelt's annual message to Congress on the "State of the Union." As usual, the President delivered his message in person. It dealt significantly with the major problems of unemployment, taxation, national defense and foreign relations.

I can understand the feelings of those who warn the nation that they will never again consent to the sending of American youth to fight on the soil of Europe. But, as I remember, nobody has asked them to consent, for nobody expects such an undertaking.

We do not have to go to war with other nations, but at least we can strive with other nations to encourage the kind of peace that will lighten the troubles of the world, and by so doing help our own nation as well.

We must look ahead and see the possibilities for our children if the rest of the world comes to be dominated by concentrated force alone—even though today we are a very great and a very powerful nation.

We must look ahead and see the effect on our own future if all the small nations throughout the world have their independence snatched from them or become mere appendages to relatively vast and powerful military systems.

We must look ahead and see the kind of lives our children would have to lead if a large part of the rest of the world were compelled to worship the god imposed by a military ruler, or were forbidden to worship God at all; if the rest of the world were forbidden to read and hear the facts—the daily news of their own and other nations—if they were deprived of the truth which makes men free.

We must look ahead and see the effect on our future generations if world trade is controlled by any nation or group of nations which sets up that control through military force.

Of course, the peoples of other nations have the right to choose their own form of government. But we in this nation still believe that such choice should be predicated on certain freedoms which we think are essential everywhere. We know that we ourselves will never be wholly safe at home unless other governments recognize such freedoms.

For many years after the World War blind economic selfishness in most countries, including our own, resulted in a destructive mine field of trade restrictions which blocked the channels of commerce among nations. This policy was one of the contributing causes of existing wars. It dammed up vast unsalable surpluses, helping to bring about unemployment and suffering in the United States and everywhere else.

To point the way to break up the log jam, our Trade Agreements Act was passed, based upon a policy of equality of treatment among nations and of mutually profitable arrangements of trade.

Our present trade-agreement method provides a temporary flexibility and is, therefore, practical in the best sense. It should be kept alive to serve our trade interests, agricultural and industrial, in many valuable ways during the existing wars.

The old conditions of world trade made for no enduring peace; and when the time comes, the United States must use its influence to open up the trade channels of the world in order that no nation need feel compelled in later days to seek by force of arms what it can well gain by peaceful conference. For this purpose we need the Trade Agreements Act even more than when it was passed.

For several years past we have been compelled to strengthen our own national defense. That has created a very large portion of our Treasury deficits. This year, in the light of continuing world uncertainty, I am asking the Congress for army and navy increases which are based not on panic but on common sense. They are not as great as enthusiastic alarmists seek. They are not as small as unrealistic persons claiming superior private information would demand.

The only important increase in any part of the budget is the estimate for national defense. Practically all other important items show a reduction. Therefore, in the hope that we can continue in these days of increasing economic prosperity to reduce the federal deficit, I am asking the Congress to levy sufficient additional taxes to meet the emergency spending for national defense.

Behind the army and navy, of course, lies our ultimate line of defense—"the general welfare" of our people. We cannot report, despite all the progress we have made in our domestic problems—despite the fact that production is back to 1929 levels—that all our problems are solved. The fact of unemployment of millions of men and women remains a symptom of a number of difficulties in our economic system not yet adjusted.

We met a problem of real fear and real defeatism in 1933. We faced the facts with action, not with words.

The American people will reject the doctrine of fear, confident that in the thirties we have been building soundly a new order of things different from the order of the twenties. In this dawn of the decade of the forties, with our program of social improvement started, we must continue to carry on the processes of recovery so as to preserve our gains and provide jobs at living wages.

These words—"national unity"—must not be allowed to become merely a high-sounding phrase, a vague generality, a pious hope, to which everyone can give lip service. They must be made to have real meaning in terms of the daily thoughts and acts of every man, woman, and child in our land during the coming year and the years that lie ahead.

For national unity is, in a very real and deep sense, the fundamental safeguard of all democracy.

Doctrines which set group against group, faith against faith, race against race, class against class, fanning the fires of hatred in men too despondent, too desperate to think for themselves, were used as rabble-rousing slogans on which dictators could ride to power. And once in power they could saddle their tyrannies on whole nations, and on their weaker neighbors.

This is the danger to which we in America must begin to be more alert. For the apologists for foreign agressors, and equally those selfish and partisan groups at home who wrap themselves in a false mantle of Americanism to promote their own economic, financial, or political advantage, are now trying European tricks upon us, seeking to muddy the stream of our national thinking, weakening us in the face of danger by trying to set our own people to fighting among themselves.

We must as a united people keep ablaze on this continent the flames of human liberty, of reason, of democracy, and of fair play as living things to be preserved for the better world that is to come.

Premier Daladier

—Extracts from a speech by Premier Edouard Daladier in the French Senate. The note struck by Lord Lothian and other British statesmen—that plans are forming for a federal union in Europe when peace comes—is also sounded by the Premier of France. His most significant remark is that "perhaps federative bonds must be envisaged between the various European states."

The French army is fighting to put an end to a regime of force that has weighed over Europe during these past years, to put an end to a policy of rapine and prey.

Premier Daladier

The community of action between the empires of Great Britain and France is established in an agreement whose consequences are incalculable. British and French, we have dismissed national egoism from our plan of action. Animated by the same ideal and pursuing the same ends, we have united in common action whose goal is victory.

This agreement has been enlarged by the distribution on an equitable basis of all common charges and by the establishment of complete solidarity between our two moneys, the franc and the pound sterling.

This Franco-British union is open to all. But I declare solemnly that without material and positive guarantees France will not lay down her arms.

Just as I mistrust great Utopian conceptions, so am I a partisan of material guarantees against the return of such events as those from which we are suffering today; and so also do I conceive that the new Europe should have a wider organization than that which has existed until now.

Commercial exchange must be multiplied, and perhaps federative bonds envisaged between the various European States. We are ready for our part to collaborate with all who pursue the same aims as ourselves. I shall add that all efforts of German propaganda to break this Franco-British solidarity will fail.

Lord Lothian

—Excerpts from an address by the Marquess of Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States, before the Chicago Council of Foreign Relations. The address attracted wide attention because of its concern with the possibility of creating a federal union of democracies in Europe after the present war—a new kind of League of Nations. This federation proposal is being heatedly discussed in France, Britain and many neutral countries.

The kind of world of which the democracies dreamed twenty years ago was not a false dream. We think it was a right dream and that in some form it must be realized because in substance it is the only way forward for those who believe in liberty and the freedom of the human spirit.

But it is now clear that in 1919 none of us understood what it was necessary to do if our hopes were to be fulfilled. The ideals which lay behind the League of Nations can only succeed if all its members are democracies. The covenant of the League was too rigid. It had no effective machinery for making changes peacefully. The principle of universal national self-determination was incompatible with the unity recently given to the world by mechanical invention and economic progress and made both peace and prosperity impossible.

Yet, if any form of world organization is to work, Europe must be equipped to manage its own internal affairs by some system of federalism. The greatest of our mistakes were economic. What did more to wreck civilization than anything else was the belief that a war-stricken world could recover by a system which combined immense international indebtedness with unrestrained tariff protectionism. That was probably the major cause of the world depression of 1929.

We profoundly hope that the nations will think out far more thoroughly than they did last time how the world can be economically reconstructed when the present war is over. Trade and production will then be in dislocation. The needs of the war will have canalized the trade not only of the belligerents but of the neutrals. Those canals will serve war and not peace purposes.

Yet to go back immediately to an economic free-for-all fight will simply mean that the end of this war will produce worse results than the last. In my personal view it will be imperative for a time to maintain these controls, but to reverse their purpose, so that they are used to restore the standard of living without which the end of this war will only be the signal for fiercer revolution and fiercer wars than the last. Once the standard of living is restored with all that means in markets for the producing nations, we should be able safely to return to a freer economy.

We feel that the only foundation for a stable and liberal world will be the control of the seas on agreed principles by the democracies. This view we base upon experience, for that was the foundation of the remarkable Victorian Age.

But the nineteenth-century system cannot now be restored in its old form. In the first place, economically the world has advanced beyond laissez faire, whether in trade or migration. In the second place, Britain neither can nor ought to play by herself the dominant role she played in the last century.

The rights of new naval nations and the rise of air power make that impossible. And sea power should be in the hands of the democracies, and not of one power. Even at this moment, if we face honestly the facts, our present safety rests upon the fact that we control the Atlantic and you control the Pacific. Neither we nor you, nor the overseas republics and dominions, would be so secure if either of us was left to act alone.

The nineteenth-century system, of course, was by no means perfect. But can any fair-minded person doubt that, on the whole, it promoted freedom, prosperity and peace better than any system which preceded it in modern times? And can any fair-minded person believe that if Herr Hitler and his friends were to win the war and seize its sea power and sea bases from Britain the world would get any equivalent prosperity or freedom? It might get peace, but it would be a peace with the light of liberty gone out. That is the real answer to the charge that this is a mere war between imperialisms.

The British Government is not trying to drag you into this war. It knows that no democracy will accept the hideous consequences of war unless it is convinced that its own vital interests, which include its ideals, are at stake. It knows, too, that there is nothing on which the American people are more determined than to avoid entanglement in Europe, and to pursue their own independent international policy, free from alliances and commitments to other nations. If ever you are driven to action it will not be because of propaganda but because of the relentless march of events.

In this war we believe we are fighting for principle; to prevent the ideas and institutions which alone can lead mankind forward to greater liberty, prosperity and peace from being overwhelmed by brute force.

We do not think that we have a monopoly of virtue, or that we have not made many and grievous mistakes in the past. But we are sure we are in the right now. This faith is held not in England alone but not less strongly in France, in Canada, in Australia, in South Africa, in New Zealand and among the other peoples who have joined our side in this war.

We are not fighting for empire or for domination or to deprive Germany of any legitimate right. I have long been a deep admirer of President Lincoln. I believe we are fighting in the spirit he so nobly described in his second inaugural. "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

Chronology of the European War

DECEMBER 21—Russian fliers, celebrating Stalin's 60th birthday, bomb the southern cities of Finland, damaging the hospital zone in Helsinki.
—The Red Army forces in the Arctic region are checked by the Finns and in the South the Finns claim a victory in Karelia.
—London announces that 10 per cent of Germany's normal imports have been seized since the start of the war while three neutral ships are sunk on a quiet day.

DECEMBER 22—The French Intelligence Service reports that the German fleet has left Hamburg "in full force", half of it headed into the Baltic and the other half into the North Sea.
—Finnish defenders report new successes on all fronts against the invading Russian forces and Leningrad hospitals are reported filled with wounded.
—Four German and two British planes are shot down on the Western Front, while a British trawler and two neutral vessels are sunk at sea.

DECEMBER 23—President Roosevelt names Myron C. Taylor as his personal representative at the Vatican and in a second move in the cause for peace, he calls upon Pope Pius and Protestant and Jewish leaders for cooperation.
—The United States and the twenty other American republics issue a joint protest to Britain, France and Germany against violations of the safety zone set up around the Western Hemisphere.
—The Finnish High Command reports a savage battle at Aglaejaervi on the southeastern front in which a large Russian force was virtually destroyed before it could surrender.

DECEMBER 24—Pope Pius outlines five conditions which he considers essential for "a just and honorable peace" in a speech to the Sacred College of Cardinals: The guarantee of independence to all nations; general disarmament; creation or reshaping of international bodies to assure observance of international undertakings; the fulfillment of "the true needs" of nations and ethnic minorities; and abandonment of all hatreds for "moral justice" in keeping with Christian ideals.
—Russian planes bomb Viborg, but otherwise it is quiet on the Finnish front.
—Irish terrorists raid the National Army's magazine at the fort in Phoenix Park, Dublin, and drive off with four truckloads of supplies.

DECEMBER 25—The war is carried onto Soviet soil when the Finns drive across the border toward Russia's vital railway to Murmansk. The Russians claim a victory in Suomussalmi region and continue to bombard Viborg and other southern towns.
—Irish Republican Army rioting spreads throughout Northern Ireland, and sixty Republican prisoners in the Londonderry jail set fire to the prison. Scores of rebel suspects are seized in raids in Belfast.

DECEMBER 26—The Finns are reported to have thrown back Russian troops on the Karelian Peninsula, and 700 Reds are left dead on the ice of Lake Suvanto.
—The Pope follows his scathing condemnation of Russia's invasion of Finland by announcing that he has sent a substantial sum for the relief of Finnish Catholics.
—France and Britain announce an increase in shipments of planes and war materials to Finland.

DECEMBER 27—Finnish troops make their second crossing to the Soviet frontier east of Salla where the border is nearest the railroad to Murmansk.
—Britain and Sweden sign a war trade agreement to adapt the existing trade pact to war-time conditions to assure the Swedes of Britain's help in whatever turn the war may take.
—An estimated 6,000 people are killed in a night of terror when seven earthquake shocks rock eastern and northern Anatolia, in Turkey.

DECEMBER 28—Fighting occurs on two sectors on Russian soil close to the eastern frontier as Finnish troops are officially reported pressing deeper toward the important Soviet base at Repola.
—Moscow places General Gregory M. Stern, hero of the "vest-pocket" Russo-Japanese war in 1938, at the head of the Soviet troops fighting against Finland. At the same time it is announced that General K. A. Meretskoff was recalled on December 22 to explain his failure to score successes in Finland.
—Pope Pius XII returns the visit of King Victor Emmanuel. It is the first visit of the sort that any Pope has made since before 1870, when the Quirinal Palace was part of the Papal possessions.
—The French Senate unanimously passes an 80-billion-franc budget which is submitted by Finance Minister Paul Reynaud with the announcement that it is balanced and a guarantee France has started on the task of paying for the war.
—In Germany, the Administrative apparatus of war economy is reorganized, giving Field Marshal Goering a still firmer grip on the Reich's economy.
—Apparently dissatisfied with a "bad press" Moscow imposes a censorship on all dispatches sent out of the Soviet Union.

DECEMBER 29—Despite a terrific battering along the Mannerheim Line, the Finns stand firm. Their skiers are reported to have isolated 10,000 Russians on the Salla sector of the central front.
—An unidentified British battleship of the 30,600 ton *Queen Elizabeth* class is torpedoed and damaged, with the announced loss of four men after the British Admiralty reports that the ship has reached port.
—Premier Daladier declares in the Senate that French and British war collaboration will be a model for the organization of Europe when peace comes, and he goes so far as to mention the word "federate".
—All Turkey is thrown into mourning at the announcement that more than 30,000 casualties, mostly dead, is the minimum estimate of the Anatolian earthquake; meanwhile, thousands of survivors face the threat of starvation in a zone of 60,000 square miles.

DECEMBER 30—Chancellor Hitler issues a series of New Year's proclamations which point with pride to military and political achievements but admit that "the heaviest battle is still to come", calling on the German people to stand fast and fight until final victory is achieved.
—Field Marshal Hermann Goering in an article for Hitler's *Voelkischer Beobachter* says that Germany's air force is prepared for a fierce counter-offensive "such as the world has never known" against the Allied blockade. He says "only a word from the Fuehrer is awaited to start a terrific bombardment of Great Britain."

DECEMBER 31—Propaganda Minister Goebbels warns Germany that 1940 will be "a hard year" but says he looks forward to an air offensive with new planes against Great Britain to break the war's deadlock.
—Berlin, London and Paris are blacked out, but London celebrates gayly.
—The Finns report annihilation of a Soviet division which had been thrusting at the country's mid-section around Lake Kianta.
—The United States Maritime Commission approves an application by the United States Lines for the sale of eight of its ships to Norway because the revised neutrality act had made it impossible to employ the ships on their former runs under the American flag.

JANUARY 1, 1940—The seaport of Abo is set afire by Russian bombs, and planes flying over the Petsamo area loose missiles on Norwegian territory.
—Britain gives formal notice of her help

to Finland and it is announced that the Allies will contribute nearly 100 planes.
—*Uruguay interns the German freighter Tacoma. Germany announces, however, that the liner St. Louis, which left New York on August 27 and took refuge at Murmansk, had been saved when it ran the British blockade to Hamburg.*

JANUARY 2—Washington lodges a vigorous protest with Great Britain against the removal from British, American and other neutral ships of American mails addressed to neutral countries and the censoring of American mails aboard ships that have involuntarily entered British ports.
—The Finns claim the capture of a Russian base and the repulse of a Soviet attack on the eastern front as well as reporting that 26,000 Soviet troops have been trapped in the north.
—A new wave of arrests of Czechs in the Bohemia-Moravia Protectorate is reported, the victims being former Army officers, members of the office staff of the Skoda works and prominent journalists.

JANUARY 3—Addressing the reconvening of Congress, President Roosevelt voices America's hope of remaining at peace, but recommends emergency measures for defense, and means for cooperating with other nations "to encourage the kind of peace that will lighten the troubles of the world."
—Rome sees trouble ahead with the Soviet with the announcement that Augusto Rosso, the Italian Ambassador, has been recalled.
—Another Russian division, rushed to rescue the division that was shattered by the Finnish Army on the ice of Lake Kianta on December 29, is cut off from its supply base and surrounded, according to official Helsinki reports.

JANUARY 4—President Roosevelt, submitting a budget for 1941 calling for expenditures of $8,424,000,000, recommends new taxes to bring in at least $460,000,000 to finance an emergency program of national defense.
—Lord Lothian, British Ambassador to the United States, speaking before the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, says that the peace which will follow this war must be based upon some system of federalism for Europe.

JANUARY 5—Leslie Hore-Belisha, Secretary of State for War, resigns in a sudden shakeup of Prime Minister Chamberlain's War Cabinet. He is succeeded by Oliver Stanley, President of the Board of Trade and the son of the Earl of Derby, who was War Secretary from 1916 to 1918.
—The German press warns Sweden and Norway that they risk becoming battlefields if they continue to allow Allied aid to reach Finland through their territory.
—The Swedish Foreign Office requests an investigation by Russian authorities into the shelling of a Swedish ship without warning by a supposed Soviet submarine.

JANUARY 6—Dismissal of Leslie Hore-Belisha causes a widespread demand in Britain for an explanation from Prime Minister Chamberlain.
—*The Red Star*, Soviet Army organ, accuses Britain and France of trying to drag the Scandinavian countries into the war, and warns Sweden and Norway to cease aiding the Finns.
—The U. S. liner *Manhattan* is halted by the British contraband control at Gibraltar. From two other American vessels—the *Exilona* and *Executive*—80,000 feet of nickel tubing is seized by the British at Gibraltar.

JANUARY 7—In reply to German newspaper charges that the Allies are using the pretext of aiding Finland as an excuse to gain a foothold in Scandinavia for an attack on Germany, the press of Sweden and Norway declares that those countries will reject "with arms if necessary" any attempt by any power to use their territory as a springboard for an attack against another.
—Foreign Minister Csaky abruptly ends his visit with Foreign Minister Ciano in Venice and hurries back to Budapest to report on the conversations in which Italy is said to have coaxed Hungary not to press its claims against Rumania.

JANUARY 8—A defensive alliance between Italy and Hungary, assuring Hungary of full Italian support in the event of attack by either Germany or Soviet Russia, is reported to have been arranged by the Foreign Ministers of the two nations.
—Another victory against the Russians is announced by the Finnish high command, which says that the 44th Red Army Division, which had been to the rear of the ill-fated 163d in the Suomussalmi sector of North Central Finland, has been wiped out.
—Senator Carter Glass of Virginia says he would be willing to lend Finland $60,000,000 "even if we have to borrow it."

JANUARY 9—Nazi planes machine-gun a dozen vessels in the North Sea, sinking two and disabling a third. Three other ships, including the 10,002 ton liner *Dunbar Castle*, bound for South Africa, are sunk by mines. Thirty-five lives are lost.
—In his first public address of the new year, Prime Minister Chamberlain predicts that a "grimmer phase of the war is coming". He denies that the aim of the Allies is the "annihilation of the German people" but declares that the Germans must realize that "prolongation of this war is their responsibility as well as that of the tyrants who rule them." He praises President Roosevelt's peace message to the Pope, says Britain's aid to Finland will be "real," and forecasts a wider system of European collaboration.
—The French Chamber of Deputies forcibly ousts four of seven Communist deputies.
—*Moscow admits the retreat of the Red forces in the Suomussalmi sector.*
—The Balkan entente—Turkey, Greece, Rumania and Yugoslavia—is summoned to meet at Belgrade on February 2 on the heels of the reported Italo-Hungarian defensive alliance.
—President Roosevelt discloses that he has prepared general objectives which he regards as essential to any just and lasting peace "against the time when a peace initiative will become feasible." The plans were outlined to leaders of the Baptist, Lutheran and Seventh Day Adventist churches at the White House under a pledge of secrecy.

JANUARY 10—While Finnish ski troops finish mopping up remnants of the Russian 44th and 163d divisions, routed in fourteen days of bitter fighting, a third Soviet division is reported trapped south of Suomussalmi.
—British bombers raid German air bases on the North Sea Island of Sylt and an important Helgoland anchorage.
—Nazi planes continue to war on ships at sea. To date 133 British, 13 French, 23 German and 94 neutral vessels have been sunk.
—The Japanese Navy and Army jointly serve notice upon French authorities in Shanghai that munitions shipments over the French-owned Haiphong-Yunnan railway into China must stop before January 23 or aerial bombers will destroy every bridge on the line.

JANUARY 11—King Gustaf V, opening the new session of the Swedish *Riksdag* (Parliament) pledges to Finland "all the humanitarian and material help possible with due consideration to our own position."
—A shakeup in the Soviet Army and recall of more than 100 officers for failure to achieve greater success in Finland is reported.
—Admiral Stark says before the House Naval Affairs Committee that the United States must take into consideration the possibility of the defeat of the Allies, and explains that this is the basic reason why the Navy should immediately be increased by at least 25 percent.
—Rear Admiral Kanazawa, spokesman for the Japanese Navy, expresses Japan's dissatisfaction with the proposed increase in the United States Navy, and declares that Japan's naval policy is one of non-menace and non-aggression.

JANUARY 12—Mass bombing raids are carried out over many parts of Finland as Russian fliers take advantage of the first clear weather in more than a week.
—Nazi fliers continue their scouting operations over the English coast but are driven off after inspecting five vital areas. Two more British ships are destroyed by planes and two others by mines.
—King Haakon, opening the Norwegian *Storting* (Parliament), pledges every effort to maintain Norway's neutrality, and mentions his Finnish neighbors only by "hoping the new year will bring peace for all human beings especially for our brother country in the East."

—Meeting in secrecy, King Carol of Rumania and Prince Paul, Regent of Yugoslavia, confer at the hamlet of *Vrsec* where, on the pretense of a hunting party, they discuss the Balkan situation.
—President Roosevelt urges Congressional leaders to agree on non-partisan action on further aid to Finland.
—Two giant ocean liners, different from any ever before designed or built, are announced as on the program of the United States Maritime Commission for construction in the near future. Designed primarily for trans-Pacific passenger trade, they can be used, in the event of war, as naval aircraft carriers.

JANUARY 13—At least 50 bombs are dropped on Helsinki in the severest air raid since the start of the Russo-Finnish war on December 1.
—Moscow brands claims of Finnish victories as "childish lies" and attacks the foreign press for reporting such victories.
—A squadron of British bombers, starting from behind the Maginot line in France, penetrate deep into East Germany, dropping leaflets over Vienna and Prague in what is described by London as the greatest mass air survey of the war.
—Summing up the first four months of naval warfare, French Minister of Marine Cesar Campinchi declares that the German naval warfare has failed, and cites the facts that only 2 per cent of the French shipping, or 11 vessels aggregating 55,000 tons, had been lost or damaged.
—A treaty calling for a balance of trade between France and Spain is negotiated. Paris hails it as of the greatest political as well as commercial importance.
—General Abe, Premier of Japan, and his entire Cabinet resign.

JANUARY 14—The spotlight of the war suddenly is turned on Holland and Belgium as they order virtually complete mobilization and begin evacuating civilians from frontier areas following reports of German concentrations along their border for what may be a smashing drive to the sea.
—Although the Western Front is quiet, it is rumored in Paris that an offensive through the neutral countries has been set for January 20.
—It is revealed that Moscow has delivered a strong protest against the recruiting of Scandinavian volunteers and allowing transit of war materials for the aid of Finland.
—Soviet fliers carry out extensive raids over Finland. The country villa of United States Minister Arthur Schoenfeld, 12 miles north of Helsinki, is badly damaged.
—Admiral Mitsumasa Yonai is commanded to form a new Japanese Cabinet and take the post of Premier, succeeding General Abe. Last summer, Admiral Yonai balked at a military alliance among Rome, Berlin and Tokyo. General Shunroku Hata retains the post of Minister of War by Imperial Command.

JANUARY 15—French foreign office warns of possible simultaneous action by Germany and Russia against neutral nations.
—Norway and Sweden instruct envoys in Moscow to protest against violation of their territory by Soviet planes.

JANUARY 16—Senate debates suggestion by President Roosevelt for Congressional study of methods of aiding Finland.
—Controversy over ouster of Leslie Hore-Belisha as War Minister is officially "settled" as Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain denies "brass-hat" influence.

JANUARY 17—Richard J. Sandler, former Foreign Minister of Sweden, calls for Swedish troops to defend Aland Islands.
—Marshal Carl Gustav von Mannerheim, commander-in-chief of Finland's fighting forces, warns Allies that Finland cannot hold out indefinitely and that immediate help is needed. He declares Finland will destroy itself before yielding to Russia.

JANUARY 18—Explosions in the Royal Gunpowder factory at Waltham Abbey kill five workers, injure more than thirty. Scotland Yard investigates possibility of sabotage.
—Soviet troops in Lapland sector of Arctic Circle are abandoning their trenches, Finnish communique says.

Polling Public Opinion

(Continued from page 26)

sition that gains the support of an increasing number of voters, whether intensely approved by all of them or not, is a proposition which must be reckoned with in the legislatures and forums of American life.

Only a word need be said about the final criticism of the surveys—the charge that they constitute a threat to America's cherished representative democracy. Often this charge indicates more about the critics than it does about the polls themselves, for American political theory has long been divided between those who would place more power in the hands of the people, and those who are fearful of the people and would limit that power sharply. Through the history of the last 160 years the lines have formed, with Alexander Hamilton on one side arguing that "your public, sir, is a beast," and Thomas Jefferson on the other, arguing that the majority of the plain people are less likely to misgovern themselves, in the long run, than any smaller and more exclusive group of the elite.

Interestingly enough, most of the observations on the wisdom of the majority have been based on speculations, or on the actions of small groups of people, such, on the one hand, as New England town meeting groups or, on the other, the red-handed mobs which took control of the French Revolution and who left such an impression upon Edmund Burke, De Tocqueville and others.

Are these fears of the common people justified, or are they merely hobgoblins? In the last five years the researches of the American Institute have begun to chart some of the coastlines of the largely unexplored American mind, probing into just what the majority of the American people do hold to; whether they are responsible or irresponsible; blindly radical, blindly conservative or somewhere in between; and whether their judgments may or may not make sense when viewed in perspective.

A final answer to some of these questions can only be given by history, but I am personally convinced that the average American is more competent to judge what his best interests are than ever before. In part this is the result of the revolutionary impact of mass education, of moving pictures, of daily newspapers and of the million-tongued radio. As individuals, these people may not be brilliant or intellectual or particularly well-read, but they possess a collective quality of good sense which is manifested time and again.

The important point is, however, that under a system of representative democracy like our own, public opinion may only be useful in determining the fundamental human *ends* of public policy, not the important ways and means by which these ends may be obtained. The people cannot be expected to express judgments on complicated technical or administrative policies. As society becomes more complex there is a greater and greater need for experts. Nor is it in the province of the people to initiate legislation. The need for the Congressman, the intelligent representative, remains as great as ever. What has been provided by the polls is a means of ventilating the gigantic structure of modern government with fresh draughts of what the usually silent and inarticulate people are thinking.

What's YOUR Opinion?

(Continued from page 42)

"The world is ready for a plan based on virtues whose values have been demonstrated by individuals, on truthfulness, honesty, justice and good-will. The world would support such a plan. The people of this country are eager for it. We have the brains to produce it. All we need is the will of the President or Congress to initiate it."

Henry A. Atkinson

"I think that the United States has gone as far as it possibly can up to the present time. Mediation now seems to be impossible, for there is no foundation upon which a peaceful world can be built. The President, I think, is wise in keeping open the channels for suggestions regarding mediation and I hope he will lose no opportunity in pressing every advantage to this end. Peace, however, can never be established except on the assumption that all the parties will sincerely cooperate to maintain it. Peace cannot come too soon but unwise and hasty action may complicate rather than facilitate the final results for which the people in all countries are earnestly hoping and praying—a world at peace with the assurance that through collective action the peace can be maintained."

Dorothy Detzer

"It would seem imperative that the President use his incomparable power and prestige, not to follow the desires of the Allied Governments, but to lead the neutral nations in efforts for mediation and negotiated peace. I recognize the magnitude of such a task and acknowledge at once that the problem of dealing with the Hitler Government is a staggering one. Nevertheless, it should now be clear that the method of war is impotent to bring either justice or a basis for peace and freedom.

"Governments have consistently refused to remedy the inequalities which lead to conflict or to use peaceful means for the adjustment of international disputes. But in spite of this failure of Governments in the past, and in spite of this present season of fear and chaos and violence, I believe in the essential dignity and sanity of mankind. A conference of the neutrals to find a basis for a negotiated peace might fail. On the other hand it might succeed. It would seem therefore that the United States dare not lose the opportunity which is before it now and which in a few months may no longer be possible. President Roosevelt could yet become, not the great war President—like Wilson—but the great peace President—earning the eternal gratitude of the entire world."

Estelle M. Sternberger

"I don't want Finland to be swallowed up by Russia and I do admire the courageous resistance of the Finns. But we ought to ask: Would the pressure on Finland be relieved *if Britain, France and Germany came to terms? Since it will serve no good purpose to have the three western nations continue their fight to a finish, they might just as well come to terms now. If they did, the danger to Finland would be lifted.*

"The wise strategy is not to rush airplanes, guns and volunteers into Finland. Though the Russians have bungled up their campaign, they have no conscience about wasting men and materials. They will hurl human beings and bombs at Finland until that unfortunate country is buried and crushed.

"The wise strategy, it seems to me, would be for the government of the United States to urge upon the governments of Britain and France to develop formulas for European peace, on the basis of their experience and needs. We should not attempt to tell the European nations what they should do. We should let the Europeans decide among themselves on what terms they can overcome their unneighborly antipathies or do business with one another.

"We assume that Great Britain and France can win the war. We overlook the implication of that view. It means that Russia must bow to the two western nations. That does not sound plausible to me.

"We should let Europe know, in unmistakable terms, that we realize from our Versailles experience that we cannot straighten out Europe. We should be equally emphatic on the point that we do not intend to join any group of European powers in this struggle for a decision. Our mediation should proceed on that platform, plus reminders to Europe that it will harm Europe and civilization less if her nations now at war would permit the United States to be the intermediary toward arriving at a possible basis of conference—without any commitments on our part to enforce terms or to finance the period of reconstruction and readjustment.

"Our mediation should proceed without any challenging Fourteen Points which we would be committed to see through to acceptance. Let each European belligerent write its own Fourteen Points and let the United States sound out the several powers for an adequate agreement to those points—adequate to create a new breathing spell for European civilization."

John Nevin Sayre

"*I believe that President Roosevelt should immediately voice an appeal to the belligerents in Europe and Asia to skip the carnage that lies ahead and arrange an immediate truce. I believe that the President should say* that he will ask Congress to authorize very large American financial and economic aid as soon as fighting ceases and disarmament is begun. He should call for a degree of disarmament voluntarily undertaken by all nations comparable to the disarmament of Germany which followed the last war. The United States should offer to disarm with the others and cooperate in peaceful methods of change. I believe that the President should also invite all the non-belligerent nations to associate themselves with the United States in this appeal directed to the peoples of the earth."

THIS is another one of these problems which a nation of free people must study, discuss, debate and decide for themselves. An interesting thing about freedom is the fact that, if we don't use it ourselves, others will be using it for themselves and they will decide for us what our future will be. To be a citizen of the modern world, one must be able to think of himself objectively as a member of the human race, a citizen of his community, state or nation, and the world.

This and many other complex problems before us must be considered in the light of these four responsibilities.

Wendell Willkie of C. & S.

(Continued from page 22)

utility system, and cut the domestic rates in half until they were the lowest in the country.

But in his Tennessee properties he collided head on with the New Deal. The battle that resulted between the government-owned Tennessee Valley Authority and Willkie's Commonwealth and Southern became the most spectacular government-versus-business feud of the past seven years. It finally ended in compromise last summer, when the TVA paid C. & S. $78,600,000 for its Tennessee properties.

In an article for *The New York Times* late in 1937 he most graphically stated the case he has been fighting against the New Deal. The general public, watching complacently while the government was trying to devour public utilities, he warned, "may be in much the same position as the dwellers of the jungle who heard the tiger roaring in the thickets. Fearful it would raid the settlement, they held council and determined to appease it by casting out one of their number. 'It will go off and devour its victim and the rest of us will be safe,' they said. So they selected one of their number and hurled him into the grass. True to the prediction, the roars subsided.

"But the following night the tiger was back for tribute. The taste of human blood had whetted its appetite. The tribal council cast out another offering. And so it went until the whole tribe was destroyed.

"We must not presume that advocates of government ownership will be appeased by taking hold of one industry, even one as important as light and power. That will not end the drive for public ownership. The appetite for victims will return."

It was ironical that in the TVA fight Willkie became the spokesman for conservative business forces in their resistance to the New Deal, because Willkie has always boasted of being a "La Follette liberal." He was proud to "shock my Tory friends" by demanding regulation of the utility companies by the Federal government. "I admired the elder La Follette and the elder Roosevelt," he admits, "for their fight against the domination of the legislature, the courts and the people by big business. Today there is the same struggle—against domination of the legislature, the courts and the people by big government."

When the revolt against the abuses of big business burst forth in the 1932 election, Willkie supported Franklin D. Roosevelt, contributed $150 to his campaign chest—although he later publicly regretted: "I wish I had it back." Though he voted against Roosevelt in 1936 in favor of Alf M. Landon, he became no more a Republican in spirit than he had been a Democrat, no more an Old Dealer than he had been a New Dealer: To him "The greatest joy in life is to keep one's thoughts uncontrolled by formulas. I won't be dropped into a mold. I want to be a free spirit. If I wasn't one, I would be still sitting on a cracker box in Indiana."

Asia Draws Its Sword

(*Continued from page 20*)

visible in Russia and state control became more all-pervasive in Germany. Now these two mastodon powers, one strong in military organization and industrial technique, the other powerful through the sheer weight of its great manpower and natural resources, are in a state of uneasy understanding.

SHOULD the present war go against Germany it is quite conceivable that the more extreme Nazis, rather than submit to another Versailles, would wipe out the remnants of the individualist system and declare Germany a collectivist, or even a Communist, Republic. This is not a reasonable prospect in 1940. But it may well become a reality within two or three years.

Despite the invasion of Finland, I would not suggest that Stalin is likely to launch immediately on any far-flung Napoleonic career of conquest. He likes to pluck fruit only when it is ripe. He knows better than any outsider can know the internal weaknesses of his regime, the thwarted plots and suppressed hatreds with which it is honeycombed. And with the experience in Finland, he should be aware of the technical inferiority of the Red Army to any Western force. He knows his regime could not stand the strain of a major war with a first-class power. He likes to maneuver other peoples into the position of involuntarily fighting his big battles, while concentrating his fire on a supposedly inferior foe. He has fed the Chinese nationalists enough airplanes and other supplies to keep the Japanese occupied in China. And his still more brilliant coup has been the promotion of a European war from which he bowed himself out.

The Asiatic dictator may well hope that by the time there has been a genuine war "to the bitter end" in Europe there will be no first-class power left to oppose his schemes of world domination. Europe's peril is a very real and very grave one, not from the striking power of Stalin's Asia, but from the internal self-destructive forces let loose by the present European war. Can there be a miracle, a last-minute saving sense of European unity and solidarity that will halt Asia's glacial march.

Travel

Nassau and the Bahamas

In the journal of his first voyage Christopher Columbus wrote: "We came to a small island of the Lucayos." "Lucayos" is the native name for the Bahamas—the chain of seven hundred islands southeast of Florida of which Nassau, on the island of New Providence, is the capital.

The Bahamas have some of the most magnificent examples of marine life which can be seen anywhere. But the luxuriant marine coral gardens and brilliantly colored tropical fish are hardly a more vivid spectacle than the vegetation on the islands themselves. Thirty species of orchids grow there. The silk cotton tree spreads an enormous trunk and huge branches over an area a hundred yards in diameter. The red, pink, or orange hibiscus is pre-eminent among the flowers, but the oleander thrives profusely, and the royal poinciana, growing to be a large tree and blooming from June to October, is startling against the rich turquoise sea. Rarest is the lovely purple passion flower, which is difficult to see but worth the effort.

After their discovery by Columbus, title to the Bahamas was the subject of violent dispute between Spain and England for two hundred years. In addition, the settlements were subject to periodic and devastating pirate raids. Many pirates, indeed, had their bases in the islands, and a lookout tower built by the notorious Blackbeard still stands in Nassau. Not until the early eighteenth century did a succession of British governors bring lasting peace and order to the colony. Later, blockade runners during the American Civil War made Nassau highly prosperous; and still later came another boom when Nassau was a leading base for rum runners during Prohibition. But the most significant event in the recent history of the islands took place in 1859, when the Crown granted Samuel Cunard a subsidy for a monthly mail service between New York and Nassau. This marked the beginning of Nassau's basic industry—the tourist trade.

The Bahamas today have a population of about sixty thousand. Nassau itself has twenty thousand. The native-born Bahamian is called a "conch," after the shellfish which has always been an important item in the diet of the islands. The "conch" is generally a leisurely fellow, whose temperament stems from the healthy, warm climate, love of the sea, and the somewhat easy living he finds in an economy based on a luxury tourist trade.

Sponge fishing, once an industry of great importance to the islands, has declined. The only substantial export trades still remaining are straw plaiting of colorful summer hats and bags and ship-building, mostly of pleasure yachts.

Nassau is sufficiently different from any American resort to add a dash to its gay social life. Physically, it has all the attributes essential to a tropical resort. It has its own artesian water supply. Its temperature in summer rarely goes above 86 and in winter seldom below 67. The water is perfect for swimming, and Nassau has more perfect beaches within its limited area than any other spot on earth. Many world travelers say that Paradise Beach, on Hog Island—which forms, with the mainland, the harbor of Nassau—is the finest beach in the world. It is famous, like all beaches in Nassau, for it cool coral sand and clear water.

Numerous excellent guest houses and hotels have become noted for their cuisine and service. The British Colonial Hotel, largest in the West Indies, is on the site of old Fort Nassau. The Fort Montagu Hotel has a private beach, as have all the leading hotels, and a night club with an excellent floor show. The Shoreham, which has a pool, and the Rozelda are smaller apartment hotels. The Royal Victoria is the favorite of many older patrons, who enjoy its wide verandas overlooking the harbor. Yachtsmen make the Prince George Hotel their headquarters.

Nassau is a year-round sporting center. Tennis stars from the United States and Europe play in the tournaments on club courts. The Miami-Nassau ocean race is a major event bringing out the top skippers of America. Polo is a weekly attraction, and professional and amateur golfers mingle on the eighteen-hole course of the Bahamas Country Club, with its background of palm trees, sea, and fishing schooners.

The Bahamas are a great game-fishing area. Bimini, where giant marlin, swordfish, and tuna abound, has become a world center for this thrilling sport.

How do you get there? By steamship, from Miami or New York. By plane, from Miami. From any point east of the Mississippi, you can reach Nassau in forty hours or less.

Nassau has removed regulations on American passports, visas, and currency. The last is British, of course, but the rate of exchange has been stabilized to eliminate day-to-day fluctuations, for the benefit of tourists. This winter Nassau is having its most successful and gayest tourist season in years.

Monarchy and the German Army

(Continued from page 29)

Yet it was precisely this contingent of trained workers and the technical troops, drawn principally from the ranks of civilian skilled labor, which showed the first signs of disaffection in 1918. Today the skilled worker is the hardest driven cog in the industrial war machine, and is keenly aware that higher money-wages for longer work-hours buy less goods. His indispensability in Germany's economy and his intelligence single him out for a leading position in the shock troops of the growing opposition to the Nazi government. It is improbable that a new order could be established either now or in the near future without his approval and collaboration.

Who will be the leaders of post-Hitler Germany? I believe that the leadership of the new Germany—whose heartbeats are yet inaudible in the commotion of propaganda drums and rolling caissons—will not be in the hands of men whose loyalties have changed with each turn of the political weather-vane. The social and political antagonisms which smoulder behind the facade of the Third Reich are too intense to allow for a mere "changing of the guard."

The men of the future may come from the ranks of those who now do the anonymous business of fighting the war and its desperate economic battles. The new Germany will rise on the shoulders of those nameless Germans, who, notwithstanding doubts and misgivings, now follow the path of duty to their Fatherland. The future leaders may stand today in the ranks of the fighting forces as officers and privates, in the ranks of labor, or even in certain present offices of the Nazi State. They will come to the fore when the Gestapo system has devoured itself as it inevitably must, when Hitlerism has thrown away its last alibi as it has cast aside its last principle.

Too bitter are the memories which bar the return to both monarchy and Weimar Republic. The new State will have to be erected on lines which will run from national to European perspectives. Another generation may have to bridge the gap between the Germany after Poland and the Germany pledged to a European order.

Uncle Sam Counts Noses

(Continued from page 38)

plasterer or turkey will in time emerge.

The sorted cards are then put on tabulating machines, the latest models of which, developed in the Bureau's experimental laboratory, add dozens of columns of figures simultaneously. As a matter of fact, the modern tabulating machine grew out of census needs and was invented by an employee of the Bureau, which has rightly been called "the cradle of modern big business methods." It took seven years to tabulate the census of 1880. This year we shall better the record of 1930, when cities of 5,000 or more had their returns immediately, the states had theirs within seven weeks, and the preliminary total for the United States was published little more than three months after the enumeration ended. And accuracy will not be sacrificed to speed. The Bureau has so perfected its technique that the margin of error in the returns has now been reduced to less than one tenth of one per cent.

Though a marvel of its kind, the 1940 census depends for its success on our truthfulness and cooperation. Being designed by us for our own good, it will respect our individual confidences. The law forbids the use of our answers for anything but impersonal statistical totals; the disclosure of our identity is forbidden under heavy penalties. As soon as we tell it to him, Uncle Sam reduces our age or color or income to a code number and a pattern of holes in an anonymous tabulating card. So we can talk freely. And we'd better, for Uncle Sam can fine or imprison any one of us who refuses to answer or does so falsely. But this has never happened, because Americans realize that the gigantic game of "truth" is to their ultimate advantage.

Democracy Rules the Airwaves

(*Continued from page 35*)

many of them boasting a continuous life since the 1870's. The service clubs and many other groups constantly hold discussions. Adult education, surging into a strong and conscious life with the late 1920's, brought innumerable non-radio forums to birth, with round table talks, panels, and other devices. John Studebaker, the energetic United States Commissioner of Education, promoted the widely known forums sponsored by the Federal Government as devices for making democracy work. Radio discussion would never have succeeded without the background of these important non-radio activities, all predicated on the assumption that, if the people are to rule, they must prepare themselves by organized effort.

THE significance of radio discussion lies in its fortifying and expanding a democratic practice that already existed. Its chief strength is its ability to dramatize and multiply. Where groups and forums previously served thousands, radio serves millions. Furthermore, it provides a better type of service. Sweeping away barriers of space and time, it brings the voices of American leaders to American radio listeners everywhere. A little village can hear senators, generals, editors, cabinet officers as readily as a metropolis. Ransome, Kansas, has a population of 600, but its Discussion Club hears Denny's program every week. The blind, the injured, the sick can hear it. Radio discussion figuratively—and, to an increasing extent, actually—gathers the American population into a unit and lays a new educational opportunity before it.

Nor does discussion end on the air as we have seen. It promotes group meetings, and it promotes individual activities. Men and women learn about books and pamphlets to read; libraries install special "radio shelves" for such materials. Listeners talk with their neighbors, they think, they read their newspapers and magazines with a new keenness. Discussion on the air goes off the air only to march on elsewhere.

To what end does it march? Clearly, to the end of quickening the entire democratic process of popular participation in government. Discussion programs, by their presentations of fact and opinion, give Americans everywhere more information and a variety of points of view. Denny says, and will prove to you, that from election to election twenty per cent of American voters shift in one direction or the other. They are the independent-minded. He believes that radio will increase this percentage and make for more intelligent decisions at the polls.

At any rate, democracy on the air speeds up and rounds out the exchange of fact and opinion on which popular sovereignty must rest. And for America it has come at a crucial time. Our national life grows more complex. Our land is vast, our people many and widely scattered. We cannot take counsel and make decisions as easily as Denmark can, or Sweden, France, or England. All through our history we have struggled with the problem of spreading knowledge and exchanging opinions so that the elaborate mechanism of popular sovereignty might function efficiently. We have been saved from confusion in the past by great inventions—by the steamboat and the railroad, the telegraph and the daily newspaper. With the twentieth century their capacity to serve our larger and more intricate America became more doubtful. Now we have harnessed radio to the service of democracy. It might have been an instrument making for further confusion, or an agency to destroy the processes of popular government. Instead, we have thus far used it creatively, and through it we hold in our hands a great resource which with further experience may become still greater.

We are in the midst of an experiment. To date, the trend of democracy on the air is—toward more democracy. But we must keep the trend close to its promise. As we do so, we shall serve our past and present ideals. Because of the power that we hold in radio and its public discussion programs, our devotion to these programs as a people should be considered one of our most vital and creative activities.

N.L.R.B. on the Carpet

(Continued from page 32)

employers and employes. Poorly equipped with collective bargaining and labor experts and top heavy with the strictly legal view of labor relations, the Board has permitted subordinates to present complaints which would have been squelched at the beginning by a properly trained personnel.

HITHERTO the Board has considered itself a judicial body engaged in making labor law, a concept from which Dr. W. M. Leiserson, the new member, dissents. With pride the Board majority points to fifteen volumes of decisions creating labor law. Such a mass of material suggests an element of failure because the best law of labor relations is that created by employers and employes in their mutual adjustments to the day to day processes of collective bargaining. But it would be unfair to leave the impression that the Board has not aided collective bargaining. It has done much and its staff has, on the whole, been of a high calibre and devoted to its duties.

The fact that 95 per cent of the thousands of complaints filed with the Board never reached a formal hearing is not a matter of general public knowledge. About half the cases are settled amicably, much to the Board's credit, and nearly one-half are dismissed after investigation. The public knows only of the remaining five per cent of bitterly contested cases which furnish the newspaper headlines.

In view of the mounting public interest in the Act, of the expressed determination of both wings of organized labor to obtain amendments, of the unremitting demand for amendment by business organizations and the bitter opposition to the Act by members of Congress, it would seem that changes in the law at the present session of Congress would be inevitable. However, that is not the case. The Act may be amended at the present session but it is not a foregone conclusion that this will happen.

The key to the immediate future lies in the parliamentary situation. The Smith Committee investigating the Board will make its report to the House Labor Committee which is the channel through which the House will receive amendment proposals. What will the House Labor Committee do? The House Labor Committee still has to continue its hearings which were interrupted last session when the House ordered another committee to investigate the workings of the Labor Board. This move wounded the House Labor Committee's pride and may cause some complications when the Smith Committee's report is transmitted to it.

Then, too, the Senate Committee on Education also failed to conclude its hearings but these will be over long before the House Labor Committee tackles the problem of writing its recommendations. Will the Senate Committee wait until the House discloses its hand with respect to changes in the Act or will it make a report of its own? That is not yet clear.

The point is that there is plenty of room for parliamentary manoeuvering, for stalling and delaying action until Congress adjourns. If this happens, the entire controversy will be thrown into the turmoil of the national campaign and will become one of its most provocative issues.

If anything at all is done to change the Act at the present session the minimum will be an increase in the present Board from three to five members. This would be done for the purpose of eliminating Chairman J. Warren Madden and Edwin S. Smith, particularly the latter. There is reason to believe that little objection may be made to continuing the Chairman, but his future may perhaps be assured by a place on the Federal bench. With a Board of five, possibly led by Dr. Leiserson, the emphasis, it is expected, would be on proper labor relations rather than on legalistic interpretation. The new Board would be expected to "clean up" the personnel situation and make necessary changes and additions to the staff.

THERE is one direct way for the Labor Board to avert its eventual demise and that is for it to take the initiative and remove certain staff members allegedly responsible for much of the bad odor in which the Board's administration is held. This, however, is unlikely, for it is a point on which Chairman Madden and Board Member Smith differ with Dr. Leiserson. Another possible approach to this problem may be action by the White House to transfer or "kick upstairs" some of those who seem to be the worst offenders. If the Administration wishes to take this course its Republican opponents in the national campaign will not be able to force the charge that the Roosevelt Administration "failed to do anything to clear up the Labor Board mess."

However, it must not be taken for granted that nothing drastic will be done at the present session of Congress. It is a truism in Washington that "once you open the Act up you can't tell how far Congress will go." That is why both the A.F. of L. and the C.I.O. are in a dilemma. They would like to save the spirit of the law but they know, too, that in the process of log-rolling they may get what they want, but the employers may also get enough changes to recast the entire law. Whatever happens a crucial controversy on labor policy is now in the making.

OTHER BOOK-DIVIDENDS RECENTLY DISTRIBUTED FREE, TO BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB MEMBERS

—CONTINUED FROM OTHER SIDE

publication. If it is a book you really want, you let it come to you. If not, you merely sign and mail a slip, saying, "Don't want it."

You Still Browse in Bookstores

Scores of other recommendations are made to help you choose *among all new books* with discrimination. If you want to buy one of these from the Club, you can get it by merely asking for it. Or you can use these reports (we find that most of our members do) to guide you in buying from a favored bookseller. In other words, you can browse in bookstores as always, but now do it more intelligently; you know what to look for.

The Many Advantages

In addition, there is a great money-saving. Time an again our judges' choices are books you find yoursel buying anyway. *For every two books-of-the-month yo buy you receive, free, one of our book-dividends.*

So many of the Club's members ordinarily want th book-of-the-month that an enormous edition can b printed. The saving on this quality-production enable the Club to buy the right to print *other fine* librar volumes. These are then manufactured and distribute free among the Club's members—*one for every two books of-the-month you buy* For every $1 you spend for book-of-the-month you actually receive about 75c bac in the form of free books, figured at retail value.

What's Your Obligation

You pay no yearly sum to belong to the Book-of-the Month Club. *You pay nothing, except for the books yo buy.* Your only obligation is to agree to buy four books of-the-month a year from the Club

FREE...TO NEW MEMBERS

the new and completely revised

INSIDE EUROPE

by John Gunther

RETAIL PRICE $3.50

—or any one of the other book-dividends listed in coupon

If you decide to join the Book-of-the-Month Club now, we will give you free, as a new member, this book which has been recognized over the world as a really indispensable volume to anyone who wishes to obtain a panoramic understanding of perplexing international politics. The new and revised edition of INSIDE EUROPE by John Gunther retails for $3.50. This was one of the recent book-dividends of the Club. Or, if you prefer, you may choose one of the other recent book-dividends listed in the postcard at the right.

Please enroll me as a member It is understood that I am to receive a free cop of INSIDE EUROPE, that I am also to receive, without expense, your monthly magazin which reports about current books, and that for every two books-of-the-month purchase from the Club, I am to receive the current book-dividend then being dis tributed. For my part, I agree to purchase at least four books-of-the-month a yea from the Club.

IMPORTANT: Please check whether you would like us to ship the current book-of-the-month with the free book **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐

Name Mr. / Mrs / Miss } ....
PLEASE PRINT PLAINLY

Address ....

City .... *State* ....

Business Connections, if any ....

If you do not wish* INSIDE EUROPE *as your free enrollment book check box below for title you prefer. (No others available at this time.)

☐ **TELLERS OF TALES** ☐ **BARTLETT'S QUOTATIONS** ☐ **JOSEPH IN EGYP**
☐ **INSIDE EUROPE** ☐ **ANDREW JACKSON** ☐ **MADAME CURIE**

COMMON CONFESSION:

"There are so many new books I know I'd enjoy... – *but somehow I can never get around to them!*"

Yet... IF HE SPENT (ON AN AVERAGE) ONLY 30 MINUTES A DAY—BEFORE BEDTIME, OR WHILE TRAVELLING TO OR FROM WORK, OR IN OTHER LEISURE MOMENTS—HE COULD EASILY READ EVERY BEST-SELLER DURING THE YEAR, AND A GREAT DEAL MORE!

AN average of *only half an hour a day* would have enabled you to read, within the past few months every one of the following widely-discussed new books:

ESCAPE *by Ethel Vance*
KITTY FOYLE *by Christopher Morley*
THE NAZARENE *by Sholem Asch*
MOMENT IN PEKING *by Lin Yutang*
THE GRAPES OF WRATH *by John Steinbeck*
THE YEARLING *by Marjorie K. Rawlings*
THE REVOLUTION OF NIHILISM *by Hermann Rauschning*
COUNTRY LAWYER *by Bellamy Partridge*
INSIDE ASIA *by John Gunther*
NOT PEACE BUT A SWORD *by Vincent Sheean*
WIND, SAND AND STARS *by Antoine de Saint Exupery*
DAYS OF OUR YEARS *by Pierre van Paassen*

—or *any other* new books you may have been particularly anxious to read. Instead, you may have been confessing to friends that you could "never get around to reading books."

The dozen books listed at left are among the leaders on all best-seller lists. It is an interesting fact that seven of them were chosen as the book-of-the-month by our judges.

What To Do About It

Over 250,000 book-reading families—persons like yourself—have found a subscription to the Book-of-the-Month Club by far the most effectual way to keep themselves from missing the new books they are really interested in.

How The Club Works

You are not obliged, as a member of the Club, to take the book-of-the-month its judges choose. Nor are you obliged to buy one book every month from the Club.

Publishers submit all their important books to us. These go through the most careful reading routine now in existence. At the end of this sifting process, our judges choose one book as the book-of-the-month.

You receive a carefully written report about this book *in advance of its*

—CONTINUED ON OTHER SIDE

"IT'S MY FAVORITE BARGAIN"
"A bargain," says the dictionary, "is an advantageous transaction."
Telephone service is like that.
Advantageous to you because it saves time, steps and trouble. Stands guard over the security of your home. Helps you to keep in touch with relatives and friends.
And does all of this as a real bargain should — at low cost. Pennies buy wings when you reach for the telephone.
BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The World in Books

University Presses

NORMAN COUSINS

(Several years ago this department published a history of university presses. A reader suggests that the article be reprinted in the annual coverage of the presses this year, in view of the pioneering role played by universities in the history of printing, which this year observes a 500th anniversary. The suggestion is timely, but because of the space devoted to reviews and notes of new university books, the history of the presses will not be reprinted but is herewith summarized with the addition of new material.—Editor's Note)*

TWENTY-FIVE years ago few universities in this country published books. But the university press has had such a rapid and healthy growth that it has become the most notable single development in book publishing since the turn of the century. Today twenty-five of the most important publishing imprints in this country belong to universities. And gradually the popular conception of a university book is being changed. Once the term "university press book" was immediately associated with specialized textbooks, but today the reading public is becoming increasingly aware that this is true in part only. Certainly such books as Yale's *The Cruise of the Raider "Wolf"* or Oklahoma's *This Is Our World*, both of which sold well above the average non-fiction book of commercial publishers, can hardly be classified as academic.

This does not mean that scholarly works are being neglected. If anything, their number has been increased without any apparent loss in quality. What it means is that the presses have broadened their scope; they have taken advantage of their excellent facilities to publish works of wide and lasting interest. Without necessarily competing with the commercial publishers, they have proceeded on the theory that important books need not be dull books; that the spread of knowledge is the least common denominator of their objectives, and that a well written, interesting book is an important step toward that end.

Despite its comparatively recent development in this country, book publishing by universities as a regular phase of their work is at least 150 years older than the introduction of printing in Europe in 1440. There are records showing that as early as 1276 there were university "stationers" who "publicly avouched the sale of staple-books" and who sold copies of approved texts to university students. The first book printed by Oxford University is the rare *Commentary on the Apostle's Creed* attributed to St. Jerome and bearing the date 1468. Cambridge University put out its first book in 1521 on a press set up by John Siberrich, the friend of Desiderius Erasmus, who has been credited with the patronage under which Cambridge first began to print its books.

The recent histories of Oxford and Cambridge are in line with their traditions. Oxford's most important recent title, perhaps, is the famous *Oxford English Dictionary*, one of the most competent, thorough and comprehensive studies of the English language ever undertaken. The *Cambridge Modern History* was completed in 1912 after a decade of work in which "many universities and two continents were ransacked for contributors." The *Cambridge Medieval History* and the *Cambridge Ancient History* are based upon a similar plan; when completed, they will link up with the *Modern History* to form a complete history of the civilized world from its remote beginnings down to 1910.

*The 500th anniversary of printing from movable type is being commemorated this year, but the observance applies only to the introduction of the principle in Europe. Actually, the invention belongs to the Chinese, who first printed books from movable type in 1041. Thus, only a year separates the 500th anniversary of European printing from the 900th anniversary of Chinese printing.

WHEN the Oxford University Press first established its branch in New York as a regularly incorporated publishing firm in 1896 with a history three times older than the United States, only a handful of American university presses was engaged in the organized business of book publishing. The pioneers were Johns Hopkins, whose press was established in 1878; Chicago University, 1892; University of California and Columbia University, 1893. Before these dates, however, a number of universities had issued their own books or journals, though not in the form of regular university press publications. Dartmouth College, for example, published in 1819 an account of the historic Dartmouth College Case, made famous by the decision of Chief Justice John Marshall. Similarly, the University of Minnesota issued the first report of the Geological and Natural History survey of Minnesota in 1872, inaugurating a series which under various titles has been continued to the present day. Full organization of the press, however, was not completed until 1927.

From the turn of the twentieth century until 1925 the development of university presses was centered almost entirely in the East. Princeton launched its publishing career in 1905; Yale founded its press in 1908 under the leadership of George Parmly Day; and Harvard's press, established in 1913, grew from a printing office started forty years earlier. The pioneer in the South was North Carolina, which began its press in 1922.

The period of greatest growth in numbers of university presses was between 1925 and 1930, when seven schools, representing all sections of the country, went into the publishing business. Stanford University organized its press in 1925 through an expansion of its extensive printing and binding plant, which had already pro-

Current History, Volume LI, No 7, March, 1940 Whole No 301 Published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation Publication office, 29 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass ; New York office, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. E Trevor Hill, President; John T. Hackett, Vice-President; Anne Roane, Secretary; I Harvey Williams, Treasurer John A. Curtis, Advertising Manager 25c a copy, $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Canada, Central and South America and Spain; elsewhere $1 25 a year additional Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance. Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned. Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1939, at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879. Entered in Canada as second-class matter.

duced and distributed a few books. A year later Duke University, which had already been publishing the Trinity College Historical Society Papers since 1897, formally established a regular press division. And celebrating their thirteenth anniversaries this year are the universities of Minnesota and Pennsylvania. Although Pennsylvania's press was incorporated in 1920, it did not actually begin to function as such until seven years later. By the beginning of the thirties, Oklahoma, Michigan, Cornell, and Iowa had entered the publishing field. The most recent additions to the university press list are the universities of Louisiana and Iowa, the publishing division of the latter school being known as the Collegiate Press.

Not all universities came by their presses in like manner. Some came into being as the direct result of the inspiration, energy, and impetus lent them by single individuals. Charles Scribner, of Princeton, not only organized and directed the press but gave it a building and most of its equipment. The University of Chicago Press was the favorite project of William Rainey Harper, first president of the university, who believed that a university was inadequate without a "voice" to carry to the world the results of original research which went on within its walls. Similarly, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, then a Professor of Philosophy, drafted the report of a committee in 1890 urging the establishment of a publications division at Columbia University. Dr. Arthur Twining Hadley, in reviewing his administration as President of Yale University, said that "the thing on which I look back with most satisfaction is the development of the publishing work of university and the recognition it has obtained throughout the world." His successor, Dr. Francis R. Angell, added that this recognition "is a source of satisfaction to the university and must be a source of pride to all of Yale's graduates and other friends."

Many of the presses place their books in two broad categories: those having a specialized and a limited appeal, and those addressing themselves to a general audience. Under its new management, Harvard, while maintaining its scholarly studies and its official publications, emphasizes two classes of books: (1) major works of scholarship in all fields: (2) "bor-

THE STORY OF STEENSTRUP

IN 1901 a young Danish toolmaker began work in the General Electric shops in Schenectady. One day he hit on an idea for making a machine safer and more efficient. The boss had his doubts, but Chris Steenstrup proved his idea would work. Today, beloved by his fellow engineers, with 110 patents to his credit, Chris is still looking for ways to improve things.

Chris welcomes tough engineering assignments. For instance, he solved one of the toughest problems in the building of Dr. Alexanderson's great radio alternators which made possible radio communication with Europe during the World War. Back when there were very few domestic electric refrigerators in the country, Chris got the job of devising a long-lived and efficient refrigerator. After months of work he designed a mechanism that ushered in a new era in American living. For from it General Electric developed the first sealed-in-steel refrigerator mechanism—the principle that has helped bring the comforts of electric refrigeration to 14 million American families.

Chris Steenstrup's contributions to more comfortable living are typical of the hundreds made by General Electric men and women. For years they have been putting electricity to work in the home and in industry, helping to make all manufactured products more plentiful and less expensive, enriching our lives—providing More Goods for More People at Less Cost.

G-E research and engineering have saved the public from ten to one hundred dollars for every dollar they have earned for General Electric

derline" books, which combine maturity of thought and learning and accuracy of statement, with wider general appeal. Chicago lists its books in four categories, the first two of which coincide roughly to that of Harvard; the remaining categories include books of pedagogical theory and text books in modern format, and the proceedings and report of learned organizations and societies. California will subsidize its specialized books and select its general books on their sales potentialities and pay royalties to authors. Whatever profit Princeton may make on books which enjoy a good sale are used for publishing works which "contribute to scholarship and learning." Yale's list is divided into general, semi-specialized, technical and specialized, and text books. It is noteworthy, too, that Minnesota has "sought to make scholarship less forbidding; to bridge the gap between the specialist and the layman."

It is significant that many of the university presses have improved, and are improving, their sales and distribution facilities. A co-operative mailing list containing almost 200,000 educational names is maintained at the University of Chicago. These names are classified according to subjects and offer the publisher of a scholarly or specialized book ready access to a prospective market. Ten university presses—Oxford, Columbia, Chicago, Stanford, Yale, Oklahoma, Minnesota, California, Harvard, and Louisiana—are members of the National Association of Book Publishers and pay dues ranging from a minimum of $125, depending upon the size of their lists.

Few university presses are concerned with profits in the publication of their scholarly works. Scholarship, the end result of research, receives its own reward in the degree of success it achieves in advancing its own particular field of knowledge.

Columbia University Press spent years in the preparation of the works of John Milton—the first time that a complete edition of the great poet's works had ever been published. Nor did the press spare any effort or expense in the preparation of the amazing one-volume *Columbia Encyclopedia.* Harvard has published books in more than 40 scholarly series. And since 1933, the Loeb Classical Library has appeared under a Harvard colophon. Several hundred volumes in the library have been published in

CURRENT HISTORY

CONTENTS

MARCH, 1940

COVER PHOTOGRAPHY BY PICTURES, INC.

ARTICLES

Ten Points for World Peace — *H. G. Wells* 16
Congress Passes a Bill — *Jay Franklin* 19
Is Italy Winning the War? — *Henry C. Wolfe* 21
Wheeler and the Liberals — *Robert S. Allen* 25
The St. Lawrence Waterway — *Charles L. Raper* 28
Bureaucracy Rules the Navy — *Admiral Yates Stirling* 30
The Civilian Can Take It — *Bernard Postal* 33
Our Billion Dollar Rock — *Lon Jackson* 36
A Londoner Looks at Hollywood — *George Arliss* 39
HISTORY IN THE MAKING 10
WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? — *George V. Denny, Jr.* 42
Town Hall Essay Contest 45
THEY SAY 47
CHRONOLOGY 55
TRAVEL 61
UNIVERSITY PRESSES 1

Editors: JOHN T. HACKETT, E. TREVOR HILL
Associate Editors: NORMAN COUSINS, ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE
Advertising Manager: JOHN A. CURTIS
Circulation Manager: FRED ROSEN
Editorial Assistants: LOIS HALL, NATHALIE OSBORN

this series. The modern English translation of *Newton's Principia*, considered the most important scientific book ever written, was published by the University of California Press, which also distinguished itself in publishing the discovery of the anti-sterility Vitamin E by Dr. Herbert M. Stevens.

There are numerous similar instances. Stanford's list of group titles includes the Hoover War Library Publications and the *Stanford Books on World Politics*. Yale University published Charles M. Andrews' *The Colonial Period of American History: The Settlements* which was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1935. Johns Hopkins, in confining its publishing activities to scholarly works, issues no fewer than 27 separate series as well as several journals. Probably the most spectacular publication of the University of Michigan was never offered for sale but was distributed to the leading libraries of America. This was the group of Biblical manuscripts in the Freer collection, now deposited at Washington. The University of Oklahoma considers Paul B. Sears' *Deserts on the March*, which has determined, to a large extent, the government's policy toward soil conservation, one of its most outstanding works. And no mention of works of fine scholarship and research would be complete without the University of North Carolina's two monumental works: *Culture in the South*, a symposium by 31 authorities, and Howard W. Odum's *Southern Regions*. There is little question that these two works combine to provide the most comprehensive and authoritative studies of the South ever published anywhere.

During the course of their development, certain presses have won high distinction for their work in special fields. Oxford, for example, even with its outstanding achievements in all fields of non-fiction, is known as the world's greatest Bible publishing house. The record of Cambridge, too, in non-fiction rates among the world's best, yet its leadership in the publication of text books has identified it most closely with that publishing field. Johns Hopkins' scientific works have been outstanding and Chicago has always been known for its strong sociological and religious lists. Oklahoma, North Carolina, California, Stanford, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Louisiana have excelled

in publishing works on the regions they represent. Oklahoma's primary aim is to reflect the intellectual richness of the state and the Southwest, of which it is a part. North Carolina's service to the South is a matter of record, and Pennsylvania's list emphasizes State history and biography.

University press publications have always excelled in format and printing. In each year since the inauguration of the competition sponsored by the American Institute of Graphic Arts, university books have been well represented on the list of the "Fifty Books of the Year." Princeton has published books with passages in French, German, Spanish, Turkish, Arabic, Lithuanian, Greek, Latin, and Italian, all set in its own shop. California is believed to have a greater number of special characters for works dealing in phonetics and all European languages than in any printing office west of Chicago. One of California's primary publishing objectives is to "set a high standard of dignified good printing."

Brief Reviews of Press Books

LEVIATHAN AND THE PEOPLE, by R. M. MacIver (Louisiana State University Press) is the American contribution to the series that began with Ortega y Gasset's *Revolt of the Masses*, which warned of the sweeping changes the articulate and educated masses would demand when they realized their own strength. Professor MacIver's book analyzes the nature of governments in the modern world and the effect upon it not only of the articulate masses but of totalitarianism.

The book consists of three published lectures in the Edward Douglas White series delivered at Louisiana State University in 1939. The title was inspired from the term Thomas Hobbes applied to the omnipotent, bureaucratic state that was already emerging in the 17th century. Hobbes approved the tendency, believed the monster should be led by a despotic monarch. Today the Leviathan has grown to such undreamed of proportions that no single man can grasp more than a few of the reins.

"The major conflict of modern world history," notes Professor MacIver, "is not that between . . . the dictatorial and democratic principles themselves. . . . Even if the nations meet at Armageddon to decide it, it will not be decided there. For the final conflict is one between human values, it is within the mind itself. It will be settled not between states but within states."

Marshall and Taney (University of Minnesota Press, $3.50) by Ben W. Palmer, cannot be compared in importance to other existing biographies of the two great chief justices. But if we accept it as a genial, occasionally bitter, but always well-informed picture of the life that existed around these two men, the book becomes a pleasant literary effort. It is rich in anecdote and never fails to wander down side alleys of interesting information of almost any vari-

ety. Pages are devoted to the interesting careers of the adventurers around Aaron Burr, who was incidental to the trial of Jefferson, which was incidental to the story of Marshall. The book is a veritable encyclopaedia of miscellany.

Labor and Democracy (Princeton University Press, $2.50) by William Green is both a history of the American Federation of Labor and handbook of trade unionism for the layman. It tells of the battle of the United Mine Workers (Green's own union) for the right to organize and to negotiate collective bargaining agreements with the coal companies. Using this as a point of departure, Green argues convincingly in favor of union-management cooperation, social legislation, and the need for further government regulation of business. He sees the Wagner Labor Act, the Social Security Act, and the Wage-hour law as necessary and wise advances in social legislation and urges their extension. Among the specific further steps urged by this labor leader are a national public health program and ownership of the railroads.

Aside from the CIO, Green's little book is remarkably free of vituperation. Even the Communists come off with fewer battle scars than John L. Lewis. The attitude of the author is primarily constructive; what he says serves as a glowing affirmation of the democratic way of life. *Labor and Democracy* is eminently worthwhile for the layman unfamiliar with trade union principles and methods.

Other Princeton books in the category of "current history" include Thomas L. Stokes' *Chip Off My Shoulder*, an engaging and colorfully written semi-autobiography and interpretative account of America from Harding to Roosevelt by the well-known Washington correspondent and winner of the 1939 Pulitzer Prize for reporting; *The Invasion From Mars*, by Hadley Cantril, a sober, significant study of the famous Orson Welles broadcast and its significance as a barometer of public attitude toward the radio; *Words That Won the War*, by James R. Mock and Cedric Larson, a particularly timely, important description and analysis of the work of the Creel Committee on Public Information during the World War; *The Health Insurance Doctor* by Barbara N. Armstrong, an interestingly written and comprehensive study of the work of the health insurance doctor in England, Denmark and France.

For those who want their political philosophy in a nutshell, this department recommends *A Short History of Political Thinking* by Paul W. Ward, Professor of Philosophy at Syracuse University (University of North Carolina Press, $1.50).

This short book covers the development of political philosophy from Plato to Adolf Hitler. Dr. Ward, the author, makes no attempt to exhaust his subject but places his emphasis on those thinkers who have had the greatest influence on modern political theory; Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, and Marx. Not only does the writer summarize and evaluate the work of these and other men; he relates their work to the times in which they lived, providing in effect a streamlined history of Western Europe.

If you are puzzled by the Hollywood emphasis on glamour, the plethora of family pictures, the repetitious comedies, you will find many of the answers in *America at the Movies* by Margaret Thorp (Yale University Press, $2.75) probably the most significant book that has appeared in recent years on the phenomenon of the American movies.

Miss Thorp's sources of information are numerous and sound, and are backed up by a thorough knowledge of Americans and the national cultural pattern. Her book is an interesting, impartial analysis to be read with pleasure and profit.

An important new book on Yale's Spring list is *War Propaganda and the United States*, by Harold Lavine, editor of the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, and James Wechsler, assistant editor of *The Nation*. The authors explain and analyze the propagandist forces now at work in this country to manipulate and influence public opinion.

Yale is also bringing out a second edition of *Neutrality for the United States*, by Edwin Borchand and William P. Lage, with the addition of new material covering 1937-1940.

Tabeau's Narrative of Loisel's Expedition to the Upper Missouri, edited by Annie Heloise Abel, translated from the French by Rose Abel Wright (University of Oklahoma Press, $3.50), is the story of an adventurer and fur trader employed by a St. Louis merchant, Loisel, to develop the fur trade with Indians living along the Upper Missouri river. Translated from the French, the narrative describes Pierre-Antoine Tabeau's last expedition during 1803-1804, and brings to life the world of the French-Canadian fur trader. The book is of special interest to students of early American history, cultural anthropology, and psychology.

With such importance attached to our Latin-American relations, *Guatemala, Past and Present,* by Chester Lloyd Jones (University of Minnesota Press, $5.00) is particularly timely—especially since Guatemala is probably the most influential of Central American republics, and has the largest investment of United States capital.

Professor Jones, an authority on the Caribbean, has provided a definitive account of Guatemala as well as the first comprehensive survey of the economic, political, and social development of the country.

The University of Minnesota is also the publisher of Laurence E. Schmeckebier's *Modern Mexican Art* ($7.50). This study, rich in historical and sociological background, has been hailed by many critics as essential to an understanding of the country itself. It is not only one of the most beautiful books of the year, but a remarkably lucid and comprehensive analysis of current social thought, propaganda, and important social forces that have found their expression in Mexican art.

Several new books on the Stanford University Press list should be noted by those interested in history. *From Cowhides to Golden Fleece,* by Reuben L. Underhill, serves as a revitalization of the most colorful period in California's history, from 1830 through the gold rush to 1860, and provides the first biography of the key figure of that time, Thomas O. Larkin. He was the first and only United States consul to California, —confidential agent, political power,

(*Continued on page 46*)

CURRENT HISTORY VOL. LI, No. 7, March 1940

Peace Mission

From the moment he entered office seven years ago, President Roosevelt let the world know that the United States intended to have a voice in international affairs. In speeches, in open letters to the heads of foreign nations, in actions like the recall of our Ambassador to Germany as a protest against Jewish persecution, he underlined the fact that American policy was vigorous. Not since the days of Theodore Roosevelt has the United States been quite so outspoken toward foreign nations.

Dictatorship has been attacked by words. Aggression has been deplored. When war threatened Europe, in September, 1938, President Roosevelt worked to avert catastrophe. He exerted his influence again in the Spring of 1939, and once again as Summer brought war at last. Since then he has steadily worked for peace, expressing his hopes in a Christmas message to Pope Pius and last month by sending Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles abroad on a mission of inquiry.

When Mr. Welles boarded the *Rex* and sailed for Italy, there was not much thought that he would bring back definite peace terms in his leather dispatch case. But the government apparently did hope he would learn at first hand, from Mussolini, Chamberlain, Daladier, perhaps even Hitler, what the belligerents really held as their war aims and on what basis Europe might eventually reach stability and peace. The American aim was outlined in a general way by Secretary of State Hull, who revealed that the United States has been holding very important conversations with neutrals looking toward "the eventual restoration of world peace on a sound and lasting basis for all nations."

Every Inch a Diplomat

Sumner Welles at 47 would seem to fit the popular conception of what a diplomat should be. He is cool, impassive and dignified almost to the point of stiffness. He speaks half a dozen foreign languages. He has behind him the school and college training offered by exclusive Groton and by Harvard. He belongs to the best Washington and New York clubs. His background includes twenty-five years in the American diplomatic service.

In this prolonged experience with foreign policy, he contrasts sharply with Colonel E. M. House, whom President Wilson sent to Europe early in the World War to work for peace. Colonel House liked diplomacy and the atmosphere in which diplomats work, but he was self-taught and, his critics maintained, a tyro when compared to the seasoned men at Whitehall, the Quai d'Orsay or the Wilhelmstrasse.

Mr. Welles was fresh out of Harvard when he got his first diplomatic job—secretary to the Tokyo Embassy. Two years was enough of that. He moved to Buenos Aires, starting a long association with Latin-American countries that has taken him around the Caribbean circuit, made him a delegate to Pan-American conferences and installed him, for a few hectic months, as Ambassador to Cuba. He was accused, by the Cubans at least, of interfering in their affairs, of making and breaking governments, and he had the uncertain pleasure of being hanged in effigy.

It was President Roosevelt who brought Mr. Welles to the State Department as an Assistant Secretary in 1933. Except for the Cuban interlude, he has been there ever since. Two years ago he was raised to the post of Under Secretary. In that place he acts as a sort of chief of staff for Secretary Hull, and in the latter's absence from the State Department building he acts as Secretary.

Conventions Ahead

On the calendar of American politics two dates are now ringed in red. On June 24 the Republican party will gather in Philadelphia to nominate a candidate for the Presidency. On July 15, three weeks later, the Democrats will assemble in Chicago for the same purpose. Between now and then the politicos are going to be very busy indeed.

Parties always need money. While the search for dollars usually reaches its height during the post-convention campaign, it is already on. Party leaders must look after the general organization, check on their workers, study regional strength, start the publicity mimeographs. Most important of all, parties must find candidates likely to bring victory next November 5.

This sort of political game has been played in the United States ever since the rise of the modern party organization in the days of Andrew Jackson. The tricks have changed somewhat, but not the general scheme. The game goes on, reaching a grand climax every four years when the Presidency is at stake once more.

Candidates Galore

Republicans this year do not lack possible candidates. Dark-horses aside — the Republicans have not in 1920—three men stand forth most prominently: Thomas E. Dewey of New York, Robert A. Taft of Ohio, Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan. All have been actively seeking the nomination, though the Dewey and Taft campaigns have been the more aggressive.

The quest for delegates has taken the three to many platforms. Mr. Dewey has swung across the country and back. Mr. Taft has already spoken in many States and it is said he intends to appear in every one of them before convention time. Mr. Vandenberg has spoken and appeared less widely. Not until the primaries get under way in March and April will the strength of the three be tested. At the moment, public opinion polls show Mr. Dewey in the lead so far as popular strength is concerned. His political strength is less easy to gauge.

Meanwhile, the Democrats have been in a quandary, with President Roosevelt responsible. Will he, or will he not, seek a third term? Washington observers disagree. Public opinion polls show that the country believes he will—and that if he does he will be reelected. But no one knows. And until the President speaks, Democratic hopefuls are inclined to keep under blankets.

Vice President Garner alone has made an open bid for his party's nomination. Postmaster General Farley has been trotted forth as a man who would like to be President, but when a Farley slate of delegates was named in Massachusetts, it was quickly noted that the delegates were for President Roosevelt first and Mr. Farley second. Secretary of State Hull, Attorney General Jackson, Senator Wheeler and many lesser figures are in the Democratic guessing-game. All wait on the bigger question: Will or will not Mr. Roosevelt run again?

Havin' Fun?

Mr. Lewis Orates

C.I.O. chief John L. Lewis is one of America's best orators, as even his enemies and his critics admit. He demonstrated this ability a few weeks ago to the American Youth Congress, in controversy assembled, when he countered a speech by President Roosevelt.

The President didn't want the young delegates, several thousand of them, to pass resolutions on subjects they didn't understand. He meant in particular the Russo-Finnish war. Mr. Lewis told the delegates to go ahead, that resolution-passing was part of democracy. "Who has a bigger, greater right," he asked, "to protest against war, or the subtle politics preceding war, than the young men who, in the event of war, would become cannon fodder?"

It was not the first time Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt had clashed. Once, when the President made his "plague o' both your houses" remark concerning capital-labor strife, Mr. Lewis, referring to political aid given the President by labor, declared that "it ill behooves one who has supped at labor's table" to take such a stand.

Mr. Lewis's famous oratorical phrases stem in part, apparently, from his wide reading. His secretaries report for him on important newspaper and magazine articles and on new books. Often he refers to the original himself. He knows Shakespeare and the Bible, seemingly by heart. The result is rolling oratory with phrases that stick in the mind whether you wish to remember or not. He has called NLRB members "men of clay." He has uttered the epigrammatic: "In war labor must do most of the work and most of the dying." And there is his famous characterization of Vice President Garner, whom he accused, not only of whisky-drinking and poker-playing, but of having his knife out, "searching for the quivering, pulsating heart of labor."

To many Americans Mr. Lewis has become a sort of bogeyman, a dangerous force in the body politic. On his shoulders many friends and foes alike place the responsibility for the present strife in organized labor. But the strife is not entirely his fault alone.

Labor's Divided House

In "Pins and Needles," the popular and long-running labor revue, on Broadway, one skit focuses on labor's divided household. "Papa" Lewis and "Mama" Green quarrel steadily while the children—the labor rank-and-file —sing "Papa doesn't love Mama any more." The full truth is not quite so simple.

When labor's house began to divide back in 1935, the issue was one of craft vs. industrial unions. On that issue the C.I.O. finally split off from the A.F. of L. But over the years the A.F. of L. has also advanced the cause of industrial unionism. The difference between the two groups is no longer one of principle. The issue is who is to control the American labor movement.

In both organizations—each claims about 4,000,000 members — officials have built up a vested interest in organization jobs. Uniting the two groups might not cut jobs in half, but it would reduce their number, and labor leaders are hardly altruistic enough for such self-sacrifice. The result is the continued labor division —and skepticism generally that any Lewis call for a peace conference or any Green appeal for a sinking of differences promises success. And this, despite the undoubted desire for a united labor movement on the part of labor's rank-and-file.

Finns in Retreat

Guns have been roaring on the Western Front for six months, but as the present war rounded out its first half year interest centered less on the Maginot Line in France or the Siegfried Line in Germany than on the Mannerheim Line in Finland.

By mid-February, the Finns were being driven back. After weeks of heroic resistance, a nation of four million was yielding before a nation nearly fifty times as populous. One by one, the advanced Finnish positions were being captured. Day after day, the Red army launched terrific mass attacks, employing tanks, planes and artillery fire equal in intensity to anything known in the World War.

Meanwhile, the Russian newspaper, *Red Fleet*, organ of the Soviet navy, sent a wry smile around the world by declaring:

"The Finnish people know and love the Red army and are awaiting its arrival. The Red army has never known defeat. It is unconquerable today and impregnable for the future."

Meanwhile, too, the German press warned the Allies and other neutrals not to throw their weight behind Finland. The *Boersen Zeitung* warned all neutrals to be careful lest any anti-German flavor be found in their neutrality, saying:

"Germany wants clear fronts and cannot forever get along without a clean dividing line between friend, enemy and uninvolved third parties. The fact that those neutrals who attack the Reich are protected by neutral governments does not make their attacks and insults harmless chatter. Neutrality, since it calls for international recognition, cannot be adjusted, stretched or watered down, according to the comfortable notions of neutrals. It is absolute and indivisible, or it is nothing at all."

By mid-February, the Finns had asked Sweden officially for military assistance and had been officially refused. Swedish sympathy was with Finland, but Sweden was in grave fear of becoming the battleground for a giant war between the totalitarian states and the Allies.

Seibel—The Richmond Times-Dispatch

Activity in the Pacific

U. S. and Finland

Federal Loan Administrator Jesse H. Jones has a reputation for business shrewdness and wisdom. He earned it as a Texas banker. He added to it when, as head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, he was one of the most important banking executives in the world. There was reason, therefore, why Congressmen listened to him recently when he talked to them about American aid to Finland.

The subject was the proposed increase of the Export-Import Bank's capitalization by $100,000,000. (The bank, established in 1933 to aid in financing American foreign trade, already had a $100,000,000 capitalization.) The increase would allow a $20,000,000 credit to Finland for non-military goods bought in the United States. Mr. Jones approved the idea, arguing: "The Finnish Government will last a long time. They are an honorable people and they pay

their debts." Privately he repeated this argument, remarking in his Texas drawl: "Finland's a long way from being washed up."

Mr. Jones's testimony was given to a House group that was a bit doubtful of the Senate-approved bill for aid to Finland. The Finns were hard-pressed. It might be bad business to lend them money that would not, could not, be repaid by a nation likely to disappear. Not that the Congressmen did not sympathize with Finland. The whole nation has given evidence of sympathy.

Private relief funds totaling well over $1,000,000 have been raised for the Finns. But Congress had to realize that the little country, with its limited reserves, could in the long run be no match for the Soviet Union's man power. The Finns themselves said they wished the Americans could pin a man to every dollar bill sent to them.

Fitzpatrick—St. Louis Post-Dispatch

The Finishing Touches in Poland.

The War at Sea

With Britain attempting to blockade Germany and with the Nazi government endeavoring to starve out the British Isles, the war at sea reached dangerous proportions in February. Official estimates gave the number of British ships sunk by February 17 as 167, with a gross tonnage of 636,558. Seventeen French ships totalling 69,268 tons, and 151 neutral ships with a tonnage of 408,222, also went to the bottom. Meanwhile, the Germans had lost 28 merchant ships with a total tonnage of 145,386. The estimated total tonnage of ships of all nations sunk in the first six months of the unrestricted submarine war in 1917 was 3,856,800, or an average of 21,308 tons a day compared with a daily average of 7,541 tons in the present war.

Noting that both Chamberlain and Churchill had declared Britain had "wiped the seas" clear of all German shipping, Berlin accused the British of being over-optimistic. Nazi planes, added the Germans, had repeatedly and successfully attacked British convoys. The Nazis warned the world that neutral shipping submitting to Allied contraband control would be liable to attack.

In the midst of these charges, the war at sea took a sensational turn. British destroyers, acting upon "orders given by the Admiralty, with the full authority of His Majesty's government," deliberately entered neutral waters, off the Norwegian coast, drove the German naval auxiliary ship *Altmark* aground, killed several of its crew, and rescued between 300 and 400 British seamen imprisoned below decks. The *Altmark* had been used as a prison ship by the *Graf Spee*, lately burned off Montevideo. Crews of the several British freighters sunk by the *Spee* had been placed aboard her, and were being transported to Germany when the British navy — despite the reverberations which it knew were sure to follow—stepped in and set them free.

Near East: War Coming?

The sudden dramatic appearance of 30,000 Australian and New Zealand troops — "Anzacs" — in Egypt and Palestine in the middle of February hinted that the spotlight of war might soon shift to the Near East. (See map on Page 23.) Captain Anthony Eden, Secretary for the Dominions, arrived in Egypt by plane from London to deliver the King's greetings to Major General Bernard Cyril Freyberg, Commander of the Anzacs, who led this expeditionary force in a well-guarded, secret voyage of 9,000 miles.

It has long been rumored that Russia has been massing troops on the borders of Turkey and Iran (Persia), as well as along the difficult passes leading toward India through Afghanistan, to fulfill a century-old dream of establishing a seaport on the Persian Gulf and to attempt the seizure of India from Britain. When the war in Finland unexpectedly went against her, it was said, Russia's plans for a drive into the Near East were postponed. Nevertheless, the Allies were preparing for any Near Eastern emergency, whether it involved a threat from Russia or from Germany through the Balkans.

The Allies hope that, if necessary, they will be able to deploy their offensive strength on the plateaus of Iran and along the mountain ranges of Kurdistan and Armenia. With Turkey's aid Anglo-French forces could launch—presumably in Rumania's defense—a thrust across the plains of Bessarabia, and thus cut Germany's life line to Ukrainian grain and Caucasian oil from Soviet Russia.

Yet a sober estimate of the chances of success attending any large-scale military operation in the Near East and the Balkans must dampen hopes for an early break of this war's military deadlock. Vast distances, poor

communications and topographical obstacles complicate the planning of any Allied offensive.

Nevertheless, the concentration of Anglo-French troops strengthens the Allies' defensive position in the eastern Mediterranean, underscores their guarantees of assistance to Turkey and Rumania, and serves notice on Moscow that Anglo-French possessions in the Near East, notably the oil fields of Mosul and southern Iran, do not lack effective military protection. There is also a reminder to Mussolini that—should Italian non-belligerency veer too sharply towards Germany's side—the garrisons of Italian-owned Libya and Ethiopia may have to pay the price for such a move. It is a price which Il Duce may be reluctant to pay, especially in view of his prolonged difficulty in "colonizing" Ethiopia.

At present the Allies have two distinct military organizations in the Near East but eventual unity of command apparently has been provided for this "Army of the Orient." First, there are the French forces, including the famous Foreign Legion, concentrated in Syria, which is under French mandate. The French are under the command of General Maxime Weygand—proof of the importance being attached to the Near East. Also, there is the British army, of which Lieutenant General Sir Archibald Wavell is commander, and which extends over wide areas in Eurasia and Africa.

Meanwhile, the Italian press reports, with considerable excitement, the alleged Russian troop concentration in the Near East. And the Turkish press counters with pointed hints that April may bring some action on the Russo-Turkish border.

Lumière, Paris

"Here is a scurvy imperialist who refuses to give me his wife and his wallet."

Fighting Freyberg

The man of the hour in the British army appears to be Major General Freyberg who brought the Anzacs to Egypt and Palestine, and who will share the brunt of the fighting with the French and the Turks—the latter his one-time enemy—if the war actually breaks out in the Near East. Freyberg, whose job is to guard a vital artery of the British Empire, and to combat any Russo-German thrust in southeast Europe, began his career as a soldier of fortune.

Born in London in 1890, he was taken to New Zealand early in life. There he entered Wellington College and became a champion swimmer. At seventeen, overtaken by wanderlust, he went to Mexico and joined the rebel army of Pancho Villa, fighting against the United States in Villa's raids into Texas. When the World War broke out, Freyberg worked his way to Los Angeles and, arriving there penniless, entered a swimming meet and captured first prize, which provided him with rail transportation to New York City. Without enough money to cover his expenses across the Atlantic, Freyberg entered a boxing match in Harlem, the colored section of New York, agreeing to toss in the towel in a ten-round bout, but warming to his work, forgot his promise, knocked out his opponent—and promptly made tracks for the docks.

Entering the army, Freyberg was assigned to the Near East, and took part in the bloody campaign against the Turks at Gallipoli and the Dardanelles, where his swimming stood him good stead. One day, when the Turks seemed to be inflicting a terrific defeat on the British, he swam the Straits and distracted Turkish guns from an Allied landing force by lighting a row of flares on the beach.

Following two years of fighting in the Near East, General Freyberg was sent to the Western Front where he distinguished himself by the exploit of recapturing a small French village with a squad of British marines. Wounded nine times, mentioned six times in dispatches to his King-Emperor and promoted to the rank of Brigadier General, Freyberg won three decorations and a Knighthood. He has been in the British army ever since. According to his admirers, he has been defeated only twice, in 1925 and 1926 when he tried to swim the English Channel. In his last attempt,

he came within six hundred yards of the French coast but then was taken out of the water, exhausted.

Far East: War Over?

Neutral observers in China wondered in mid-February whether the Japanese drive in that country had finally spent its force. With the gesture of calling upon Chiang Kai-shek, Chinese generalissimo, to surrender, the Japanese command in South China declared that the Japanese forces would undertake no further campaigns "unless provoked." Japan, it was said, had conquered enough territory to support the new government of Wang Ching-wei, which the Japanese now expect to set up in Nanking on April 1.

The Chinese replied to the demand that Chiang Kai-shek surrender by declaring that, both in northern and in southern China, the Japanese were in retreat. The Chinese held—and with the support of many neutral military experts—that after two and a half years of war the Japanese had gone about as far as they could go in winning and holding new Chinese territory. There was every indication that from the Chinese point of view, at least, the fight was far from over.

Gandhi Follower Wins

A staunch follower of Mohandas K. Gandhi was elected president of the All-India Congress party, largest and most important political organization in India, in mid-February. He is Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, of Bengal. His election was a victory for the forces of moderation in India's dealings with Great Britain. Azad won his victory, by a vast majority, over a Communist opponent who frankly advocated violence to attain Indian independence. He will take office on March 19. The election of Azad restored him to the leadership of a party which he headed from 1930 to 1932, at which time he was arrested for civil disobedience to British rule. Since that time the All-India party has been troubled with a schism in its ranks, the moderates of the Gandhi faction, whose policy is pas-

sive resistance, quarreling with the left-wing faction, which believes in a policy of violence. Both factions, however, have the same aim: complete independence for India. The Congress party demands that Britain include Indian independence among her war aims. Britain replies that the question of India's status must be deferred until the end of the present war, in which the British hope to make effective use of India's wealth and man power.

Goldberg—N. Y. Sun

Under the Red Robe.

Canada's Election

Over the Gothic halls of the Canadian Parliament buildings at Ottawa, flags recently flew at half-mast. Purple and black mourning draped the interior. Lord Tweedsmuir, Governor General, was dead, the first Governor General to die in office since Canadian Confederation in 1867. All the pomp reserved for a representative of the Crown attended the last rites for the man who had been born John Buchan, and who as novelist, biographer and historian had been famous long before he left his native Scotland.

The Governor General's death temporarily adjourned politics in Canada at a moment when politics was in every mind. The Dominion had been warming up for a general election at the end of March, an election that would test the present Liberal government of William Lyon Mackenzie King.

Mackenzie King, a 65-year-old bachelor, has been a Canadian headliner for many years. Except for a few months, he was Prime Minister steadily from 1921 to 1930. He came back to power in 1935. A shrewd politician, a trained economist, he is opposed by the Conservative party led by Robert James Manion, a 58-year-old former physician who has been in politics for nearly a quarter of a century.

Dr. Manion has attacked Mackenzie King for alleged inefficiency in war preparations. Much has been made of charges that Canadian soldiers were sent abroad without proper clothing. The Conservatives, out for the Liberal scalp, planned to assail the government in Parliament and, by questioning in debate to obtain facts necessary to bolster their election attacks. But the Prime Minister fooled them. He dissolved Parliament, called for elections and prepared to go to the country. The Conservatives, unprepared, howled with rage.

In the present Parliament of 245 seats the Liberals have 176 members, the Conservatives 39.

Cuban Election, Too

From billboards and pastel-washed walls in tropical Havana has peered for many weeks the face of Colonel Fulgencio Batista, the strong man of Cuba. From behind the scenes he has long directed the chief actors on the Cuban stage. Now he wants to be on the stage also—as President. Though his political power is probably great enough to assure him of the job, there is opposition and the elections, twice postponed, will not be held until May 18. Meanwhile Batista posters are bleached by the tropical sun.

Postponement of the elections has been because of political strife. Cuba is going to have a new Constitution. Last Fall a Constituent Assembly was elected to frame it, with anti-Batista Cubans in control. Quarrels broke out over the seating of delegates. Opposition elements insisted that the elections be postponed until after the Constitution had been framed, and refused otherwise to take part in electing anyone President. Ultimately the government gave in.

Whereupon, the Constituent Assembly got to work in the ornate, marble hall of the House of Representatives. On the high rostrum, looking over the rows of mahogany desks, Ramón Grau San Martin presided. He is anti-Batista and is a former President, though he served less than a year following the 1933 revolution. His resignation was attributed in many quarters to American pressure born of fear that he planned radical policies in the little republic so closely related to the United States.

Ten Points for World Peace

A "Declaration of the Rights of Man" should be the foundation of any post-war world

H. G. WELLS

UNTIL the Great War, the First World War, I did not bother very much about war and peace. Since then I have almost specialized upon this problem.

The first thing that has to be done in thinking out the primary problems of a world peace is to realize this: that we are living in the end of a definite period of history, the period of the sovereign states. It is a phase of human life which may lead, as I am trying to show, either to a new way of living for our species or else to a longer or briefer degringolade of violence, misery, destruction, death, and the extinction of mankind. These are not rhetorical phrases I am using here; I mean exactly what I say: the disastrous extinction of mankind.

As I write, thousands of people are being killed, wounded, hunted, tormented, ill-treated, delivered up to the most intolerable and hopeless anxiety, and destroyed morally and mentally; and there is nothing in sight at present to arrest this spreading process and prevent its reaching you and yours. Plainly in so far as we are rational foreseeing creatures there is nothing for any of us now but to make this world-peace problem the ruling interest and direction of our lives. If we run away from it, it will pursue and get us. We have to face it. We have to solve it or be destroyed by it. It is as urgent and comprehensive as that.

Now while the guns are still thudding is the time for thought. It is incredibly foolish to talk as so many people do of ending the war and then having a world conference to inaugurate a new age. So soon as the fighting stops, the real world conference, the live discussion, will stop too. The diplomats and politicians will assemble with an air of profound competence and close the doors upon the outer world and resume—Versailles—while a silenced world gapes and waits upon their mysteries.

Let us now take up certain vaguely constructive proposals which seem at present to be very much in people's minds. They find their cardinal expression in a book called *Union Now* by Mr. Clarence K. Streit, which has launched the magic word "Federation" upon the world. The "democracies" of the world are to get together upon a sort of enlargement of the Federal Constitution of the United States (which produced one of the bloodiest civil wars in all history) and then all will be well.

This Federation project has an air of reasonableness. It is attractive to a number of influential people who wish with the minimum of adaptation to remain influential in a changing world, and particularly is it attractive to what I may call the liberal-conservative elements of the prosperous classes in America and Great Britain and the Oslo countries, because it puts the most difficult aspect of the problem, the need for a collective socialization, so completely in the background that it can be ignored.

They think that Federation, reasonably defined, may suspend the possibility of war for a considerable period; that crushing demands on them will relax and they will be able to resume, on a slightly more economical scale perhaps, their former way of living. Everything that gives them hope and a self-respect and preserves their homes from the worst indignities of panic, appeasement, treason-hunting and the rest of it is to be encouraged.

Mr. Streit's "founder democracies" are to be: The American Union, the British commonwealth (specifically the United Kingdom, the Federal Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Ireland), French Republic, Belgium, Netherlands, the Swiss Confederation, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland.

SCARCELY one of these is really a fully working democracy. And the Union of South Africa is a particularly bad and dangerous case of race tyranny. Ireland is an incipient religious war, and not one country, but two. Poland, I note, does not come into Mr. Streit's list of democracies at all. His book was written in 1938 when Poland was a totalitarian country holding, in defiance of the League of Nations, Vilna, which it had taken from Lithuania, large areas of non-Polish country it had conquered from Russia, and fragments gained by the dismemberment of Czecho-Slovakia. It only became a democracy, even technically and for a brief period, before its collapse in September 1939, when Mr. Chamberlain was so foolish as to drag the British Empire into a costly and perilous war on its behalf. But that is by the way. None of these "founder democracies" are really democracies at all. So we start badly.

Now let us help Mr. Streit to convert his "federation" from a noble but extremely rhetorical aspiration into a living reality. He is aware that this must be done at a price, but I want to suggest that that price is,

—Foreign Policy Association

International Graveyard

from what I judge to be his point of view, far greater, and the change much simpler, more general, and possibly even closer at hand, than he supposes.

Americans still look on at world affairs like spectators at a ball game who are capable of vociferous partisanship but still have no real sense of participation; they do not realize that the ground is moving under their seats also, and that the social revolution is breaking surface to engulf them in their turn.

Mr. Streit betrays at times as vivid a sense of advancing social collapse as I have, but it has still to occur to him that that collapse may be conclusive. There may be dark ages, a relapse into barbarism, but somewhere and somehow he thinks man must recover. It would, I suggest, be far easier to create the United States of the World, which is Mr. Streit's ultimate objective, than to get together the so-called continent of Europe into any sort of unity.

Plainly the successful organization of any universal collectivism will be frustrated in its most vital aspect unless its organization is accompanied by the preservative of a new Declaration of the Rights of Man, which must, because of the increasing complexity of the social structure, be more generous, detailed, and explicit than any of its predecessors. Such a Declaration must become the common fundamental law of all communities and collectivities assembled under the World Pax. It should be interwoven with the declared war

Clarence K. Streit, former *New York Times* correspondent, has proposed in his book, *Union Now*, a plan to establish, by stages, "government in the world." He holds that the only hope for world peace lies in turning back to the Federal Union system, as exemplified by the Constitution of the United States of America. He would begin by uniting the democracies, as shown above. The member states would govern themselves under a Constitution similar to the American Constitution.

The Union, according to Mr. Streit's plan, would then spread peacefully around the earth, admitting outside nations to it just as the states were admitted to the United States. Similarly, powers of the Union and of the states would be divided much the same way as the Thirteen American States differentiated between the respective powers of state and Federal government. There would be a Union postal and communications service, a Union money, a Union customs-free economy, a Union defense force, and a Union citizenship in addition to national citizenship.

The Union would guarantee the Bill of Rights to all its peoples, and would assure complete home-rule to each member nation in all fields of government not expressly transferred to the Union.

Mr. Streit suggests that the American people, as the inventors of this federal union system, invite the Canadians, British, Irish, French, Swiss, Belgians, Dutch, Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, Finns, Union of South Africans, Australians and New Zealanders to hold another Convention in Independence Hall in Philadelphia and work out a Constitution for the nucleus of World Union.

Thus united, these fifteen democracies, as shown in the map above, would own half the earth, rule all its oceans, govern nearly half the human race. They account for two-thirds of the world's trade. They have nearly all its gold. None of these democracies, since achieving independence, has been at war with any of the others in the past hundred years. Streit holds that by forming this Union they can secure peace not only among themselves but with all the world in future.

aims of the combatant powers now; it should become the primary fact in any settlement; it should be put before the now combatants for their approval, their embarrassed silence, or their rejection.

In order to be as clear as possible about this, let me submit for your consideration a draft of this proposed Declaration of the Rights of Man—using "man" of course to cover every individual, male or female, of the species. I have endeavored to bring in everything that is essential and to omit whatever secondary issues can be easily deduced from its general statements. It is a draft for your consideration. Points may have been overlooked and it may contain repetitions and superfluous statements.

H. G. Wells

SINCE a man comes into this world through no fault of his own, since he is manifestly a joint inheritor of the accumulations of the past, and since those accumulations are more than sufficient to justify the claims that are here made for him, it follows:

"1. That every man without distinction of race, color, or of professed belief or opinions is entitled to the nourishment, covering, medical care and attention needed to realize his full possibilities of physical and mental development and to keep him in a state of health from his birth to death.

"2. That he is entitled to sufficient education to make him a useful and interested citizen, that special education should be so made available as to give him equality of opportunity for the development of his distinctive gifts in the service of mankind, that he should have easy access to information upon all matters of common knowledge throughout his life and enjoy the utmost freedom of discussion, association, and worship.

"3. That he may engage freely in any lawful occupation, earning such pay as the need for his work and the increment it makes to the common welfare may justify. That he is entitled to paid employment and to a free choice whenever there is any variety of employment open to him. He may suggest employment for himself and have his claim publicly considered, accepted or dismissed.

"4. That he shall have the right to buy or sell without any discriminatory restrictions anything which may be lawfully bought or sold, in such quantities and with such reservations as are compatible with the common welfare.

"5. That he and his personal property lawfully acquired are entitled to police and legal protection from private violence, deprivation, compulsion, and intimidation.

"6. That he may move freely about the world at his own expense. That his private house or apartment or reasonably limited garden enclosure is his castle, which may be entered only with his consent, but that he shall have the right to come and go over any kind of country, moorland, mountain, farm, great garden, or what not, or upon the seas, lakes, and rivers of the world, where his presence will not be destructive of some special use, dangerous to himself, or seriously inconvenient to his fellow citizens.

"7. That a man, unless he is declared by a competent authority to be a danger to himself and to others through mental abnormality, a declaration which must be annually confirmed, shall not be imprisoned for a longer period than six days without being charged with a definite offense against the law, nor for more than three months without a public trial. At the end of the latter period, if he has not been tried and sentenced by due process of law, he shall be released. Nor shall he be conscripted for military, police or any other service to which he has a conscientious objection.

"8. That although a man is subject to the free criticism of his fellows, he shall have adequate protection from any lying or misrepresentation that may distress or injure him. All administrative registration and records about a man shall be open to his personal and private inspection. There shall be no secret dossiers in any administrative department. All dossiers shall be accessible to the man concerned and subject to verification and correction at his challenge.

"9. That no man shall be subjected to any sort of mutilation or sterilization except with his own deliberate consent, freely given, nor to bodily assault, except in restraint of his own violence, nor to torture, beating, or any other bodily punishment; he shall not be subjected to imprisonment with such an excess of silence, noise, light, or darkness as to cause mental suffering, or to imprisonment in infected, verminous, or otherwise insanitary quarters, or be put into the company of verminous or infectious people. He shall not be forcibly fed nor prevented from starving himself if he so desire. He shall not be forced to take drugs nor shall they be administered to him without his knowledge and consent. That the extreme punishments to which he may be subjected are rigorous imprisonment for a term of not longer than fifteen years or death.

"10. That the provisions and principles embodied in this Declaration shall be more fully defined in a code of fundamental human rights which shall be made easily accessible to everyone. This Declaration shall not be qualified nor departed from upon any pretext whatever. It incorporates all previous Declarations of Human Right. Henceforth for a new era it is the fundamental law for mankind throughout the whole world."

THERE, I think, is something that keener minds than mine may polish into a working Declaration which would in the most effective manner begin that restoration of confidence of which the world stands in need.

And if we, the virtuous democracies, are not fighting for these common human rights, then what in the name of the nobility and gentry, the Crown and the Established Church, the City, *The Times*, and the Army and Navy Club, are we fighting for?

The material from which Mr. Wells' article is drawn is being currently published in a book, The New World Order, *by Alfred A. Knopf.*

Congress Passes a Bill

The legislative machinery is a complicated though ingenious sifting device for our laws

JAY FRANKLIN

Nationally syndicated political columnist and radio commentator

CONGRESS is the people of the United States, reduced in numbers for convenience. It is democracy in action, showing forth its weaknesses, but also its strength. Congress is unwieldy and often verbose. Yet, though few American voters realize it, the process through which 531 harried and diverse individuals make the nation's laws is a triumph of organization.

Laws originate from four sources. The Bill of Rights guarantees to all citizens the right of petition, and how they do use it! Thirteen citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., want a law to tax chain stores. The Apostle Thomas Holy Name Society wants a committee to investigate spies. Tens of thousands of such proposals pour in; few get beyond the waste-basket and those which are introduced are invariably marked, "By Request," meaning that the legislator washes his hands of them. Only when there is strong pressure back home, as for the Townsend Plan, will he act as sponsor.

Much legislation originates with the Administration. The President by message suggests measures he thinks necessary. Recently such messages have often been accompanied by complete drafts of legislation, ready-made for Congressional action. But the most prolific source of legislation is the Senators and Representatives themselves. Some members deluge the bill clerks. The late Senator Royal S. Copeland of New York introduced as many as 300 bills in a single Congress. Veterans like him become authorities on certain subjects (his was commerce) so that they are asked to frame and introduce any legislation in their field. Congress is predisposed to pass measures thus sponsored.

Final source of bills is the government departments. Their estimates of the money they need, filtered through the Budget Director, the President and the proper committees, become appropriation bills. By Constitutional provision, all revenue bills, and by custom all appropriation bills, originate in the House.

Let us follow a bill through the gauntlet it must run if ever it is to become law. We can begin by estimating its chances mathematically. At the last regular session, 17,906 measures were introduced; 720 reached the statute books.

In the Senate, the bill may be introduced during "morning hour," actually the first two hours, of any legislative day. The Senator rises, is recognized by the chair, and offers his bill. The President of the Senate (the Vice President of the United States) assigns it to the proper committee. It is numbered, noted in the journal and sent to the printer.

There is a catch in this. The "morning hour" is observed not every day, but every legislative day. Precisely to save the time used up in the prayer, the introduction of new bills, and other routine, the Senate frequently recesses overnight, instead of adjourning. Thus in 1922 and again in 1938 one legislative day spread over 105 calendar days.

In the House, a Member just drops his typewritten bill into a small black box on the right of the Speaker's desk. Lewis Deschler, House Parliamentarian, collects the bills from this "hopper" and designates the committees to which they go. This is one of his lesser chores. Principal duty of the Parliamentarian in each chamber is to keep the chair straight on the complicated status at any moment of a tangle of motions, amendments and so on, and to cite upon the instant the precedents covering any parliamentary situation. He advises Members as well; Deschler answers at least 500 questions a day. Parliamentarians acquire their unique lore by long service on the Congressional staffs. Deschler started in 1925 as the "Messenger to the Speaker's Table," who holds the stopwatch on House speeches,—which, in contrast to Senate rules, always have a time limit.

Bills fall into two great classes, public and private. Private bills deal with specified individuals—to reimburse Ezra Jones for the damage a CCC truck did to his fence, or—these by the thousand—to increase the pension of the Widow Scraggs, or to "correct" the spotted military record of Bill Smith so that he will become eligible for a pension. Of these last two types, few get by. The War Department has become tough about them. So is the President.

Unknown to fame is the House "Objectors' Committee" of three Democrats and three Republicans. Theirs is the drudgery of scrutinizing every private bill. Unless wholly satisfied, they object, which usually kills it. Despite this double check by the standing committees and the informal committee, three bills of every seven passed last session were private.

The Senate maintains 33, the House 47 permanent or standing committees, each a little legislative body in itself. The chief error into which the public falls in judging Congress from the visitors' gallery or by reading newspapers, is not to understand

that the real work of Congress is done by these standing committees.

They are filled by the majority party leaders in House and Senate, acting as a "committee on committees." The leaders apportion memberships roughly in ratio to party strength, not through compulsion, but because they prudently look ahead to the inevitable day when they will not be on top and will expect a square deal themselves. Committee members move up toward chairmanship in order of seniority as vacancies occur. Vacancies are filled from among applicants in order of their length of continuous service in Congress.

Each committee has a number of clerks, of whom the chief clerk, at least, is generally a fixture because his guidance is invaluable to the chairman. Chief clerk of an important committee typically spends 20 years at the job, knows all there is to know about affairs of the Navy, let's say, and draws $5,000.

To the proper committee is referred each bill, as we have seen. Large committees, and some have 40 members, split into sub-committees to consider specific bills. The chairman naming a sub-committee frequently will load it with friends or foes of a bill according to how he feels about the measure. He likewise will be careful to name a majority of his own party.

If a bill is of any importance, the subcommittee will call hearings so that all persons interested may come and express their views. Special invitations will go to outstanding authorities on the subject—leading bankers, maybe, or prominent duck hunters.

As many as a dozen such hearings go on at the same time in the Capitol, the Senate and House Office Buildings. This is where your Congressman was when you visited the gallery and saw the floor half empty. True, no committee may sit while the Congress is in session, except by special permission. But it is routine for the important committees to get this permission, and the members come trooping through the underground corridors and onto the floor only when bells have warned them that a roll call vote is about to be taken.

Committee hearings may last a few hours, or many weeks. The Appropriations Committee in the last Congress worked eight hours a day for five months. It is a grind. You will see the office buildings blazing with light night after night and long ranks of Congressmen's cars parked outside.

Small hearings are likely to be held somewhere in the Capitol. Committeemen and the witness sit at one long green table. The atmosphere is friendly, informal, and thick with smoke. Big hearings are more ponderous, held in magnificent marble rooms, with committeemen on a raised dais so that the witness has to look up awkwardly. Crowds sometimes attend, particularly if some notable is to take the stand.

When the committee decides it has heard all the testimony it needs, it goes into closed session to deliberate what recommendations it will make. It is likely to redraft the bill in the light of the information it has gathered. Whereupon it will call in the Legislative Counsel.

The Legislative Counsel expresses no opinion on policy; he is an expert at writing laws. He will undertake to see that a bill conflicts with no existing law, that it will stand up in court, that its intent is clear, and that in so far as possible it facilitates the work of whoever must administer it.

Such counsel first appeared as volunteer assistants to two Congressional committees, sent by Columbia University Law School. The two attorneys made such a hit that both the House and the Senate formally created the office. Middleton Beaman was one of the men; he still is Legislative Counsel to the House.

The new bill drawn, or the old bill amended, the majority report framed —again with assistance of Counsel because courts in construing a law sometimes look back to the legislative proceedings—and perhaps a dissenting minority report written, the matter goes before the whole committee. It accepts, rejects or amends the work of the subcommittee and reports to the Senate or House. Or maybe decides not to report the measure at all. In fact, that is what happens to nine out of ten bills—they go to committee and are never heard from again. When a Congress goes out of office, they all die automatically.

Now the bill goes on the calendar, a list of bills ready for action. Broadly speaking, bills earliest reported stand best chance of passage, being at the top. But there are exceptions. In the Senate anyone may move to take up any bill regardless of its place on the list. The majority leaders take advantage of this rule and form a "steering committee" to decide which pet measure shall be pushed ahead.

Any Senator has the right to propose amendments to any bill under consideration and, unless it is a general appropriation bill, the amendment need not bear the remotest relation to the bill's subject matter. Of these "riders," a famous one is the Thomas amendment to an agricultural bill authorizing the President to print up to three billion dollars in greenbacks. The House, by contrast, enforces strictly the "rule of germaneness."

Each and every Senator talks as long as he pleases on any bill unless, as rarely, a cloture rule is applied. Unlimited debate is a Senator's most jealously guarded prerogative; a Senator will fight tooth and nail for some bill, yet refuse to vote to limit opponents' debate on it. Once a Senator has the floor, he need not yield it, and may continue to talk until he drops from exhaustion. And if he

(Continued on page 59)

Is Italy Winning the War?

HENRY C. WOLFE

On the evening of August 27, 1939, I was riding in an Italian train approaching the French frontier. Europe was on the verge of war, mobilization was under way in half a dozen countries, the Old World was still reeling from the shock of the Nazi-Soviet deal; yet Italy looked normal and quiet. Italian passengers laughed and joked. The cars were illuminated and the blinds were up. The towns of Piedmont were lighted and promenaders strolled the streets. Cafe terraces were crowded.

At Modane, the border station, we passed immediately from an atmosphere of peace to an atmosphere of war. French police pulled down the train blinds and replaced the ordinary electric bulbs with blue ones. We entered France to find every town along the way completely blacked out. The Third Republic was prepared for a Blitzkrieg from the Third Reich. Italy, it was obvious, was not.

In the four days since the announcement of the Berlin-Moscow pact I had been trying to learn Italy's intentions in the face of war. Would the Italians march with Germany, their Axis ally? All my Italian sources of information agreed: "There will be no war involving Italy." As for the rest of Europe—well, they shrugged their shoulders. No one, they said, could tell what the Nazis might do. Or, for that matter, the French and British. But Italy was going to remain at peace.

In France, however, the government was in no mood to depend on hearsay about Italy's intentions. So Daladier called in the one man who could be depended upon to learn whether Mussolini proposed to stand by Hitler when war broke out. That man was Pierre Laval, former Premier and Foreign Minister, co-author with Sir Samuel Hoare of the Hoare-Laval Plan for the partition of Ethiopia. When that ill-starred pact was announced in December 1935, it was greeted by a storm of criticism.

Now, nearly four years later, however, many Frenchmen had come to realize that it represented an effort to forestall a Berlin - Rome Axis and to block Hitler in Central Europe.

When the Italophile Laval left Paris for Rome late last August, there was nothing about his journey in the French newspapers. Only the best informed people in France knew that he had gone to the Italian capital, and few Italians knew that the French statesman was their guest.

Yet Laval's unobtrusive trip to Italy was one of the most important diplomatic missions in recent history. For the man who once presided over the destinies of France went down to see his old friend, Mussolini, and to carry a message from the French government. The message was entrusted to Laval, rather than to the French Ambassador in Rome, because of the former Premier's pro-Italian views. He could say things to the Duce that no other man could say. And he was shrewd enough to say those things only behind the scenes. He could be depended upon to avoid any action that would compromise the Duce's prestige and make it awkward for the Italian Premier to follow a moderate course.

The best informed people in Paris say that what Laval told Mussolini was something like this: "Benito, you know that I am an old friend of yours and a good friend of Italy. You and I can speak frankly because we are a couple of old political horse traders. So I have been sent down here by my government to find out just what you are going to do if war comes.

"We Frenchmen want to be on good terms with you Italians. We do not want to shed any blood on our Italian frontier. But this Rome-Berlin Axis business has gone far enough. We must know right now where you stand. If you enter the war we shall know what to do. If you stay out and declare an uncertain neutrality, a neutrality that would tie up a large French army on your frontier and in North Africa, we shall know what to do. We shall be forced to consider such untrustworthy neutrality as a declaration of war against us.

"Then we shall go after you from the land, from the sea and from the air. We shall blockade you and cut you off from your colonies. We realize that we cannot hope soon to get through Germany's Siegfried line, but we know that we can reach you. What is your answer, old friend?"

Outside the innermost circles at the Quai d'Orsay, no one knows just what Mussolini replied. But Frenchmen who are in a position to speak believe that the Duce's answer was something like this: "Pierre, old friend, Italians have no reason for entering the war against you. True, we have certain territorial claims which must be settled before long. But I still believe they can be adjusted through diplomacy. In regard to Berlin, we have been exercising a

moderating influence. Count Ciano is doing all he can to prevent a German attack on Poland. Goering, too, has advised the Fuehrer to go slowly. But the von Ribbentrop-Goebbels-Himmler group may carry the day for war. In that event, we have advised Herr Hitler, our obligations do not require our entry into the war.

"As for the Rome-Berlin Axis, it is not what it was a few days ago. The Berlin-Moscow pact has changed everything. We were not consulted before the Reich entered this entente with the Soviet. The Italo-German anti-Comintern pact has been destroyed. We Italians do not intend to be pulled into a war that can ultimately serve only to promote Bolshevism. So go back to Paris, my dear Pierre, and tell your Government that Italy intends to maintain a policy of non-belligerency."

Whatever Mussolini's exact words, they carried conviction. For when Laval returned to Paris and made his report, Franco-Italian relations relaxed. And the French press began to treat all matters pertaining to Italy with the utmost tact. Observers in France concluded that the swarthy Laval, who is said to have the "trading technique of a Moroccan rug dealer," had scored a significant victory.

But the Duce has not claimed that Italy is neutral. It is a "non-belligerent." Not even the Duce could tell you how long that status can be maintained. For Mussolini must keep his policies balanced to suit changing international developments. He must think in terms of Italy's relations with Germany, with the Western democracies, with Russia, with Turkey and with the Balkans. Moreover, no one knows better than the Duce that from now to the end of the war is the time for gaining the territorial concessions he wants for Italy.

UNDOUBTEDLY, Mussolini did everything in his power to head off war last year. He worked to head off war because peace is better than war for Italy's national welfare. The Rome-Berlin Axis was a formidable and profitable weapon for both partners as long as an open conflict could be postponed. It was a superlative form of blackmail. Both Italy and Germany used it for all they could get. But, though it was a diplomatic shillalah, as a military alliance it was not taken at its face value by objective critics in Rome and Berlin. The reasons are clear. Italy would be a convenient target for a Franco-British offensive. Moreover, Italy is even more deficient in raw materials than the Reich, hence vulnerable to a blockade.

Since the outbreak of the war the Duce has indicated that he favors a negotiated peace. Then the "Pact of Steel" with Germany could be reaffirmed and Mussolini could again indulge in the bold diplomacy of the past five years. He could hold the balance of power even more completely in peace than in war.

Moreover, the war has caused some economic losses for the Italians, though they have increased their trade in some markets formerly dominated by the belligerents. In normal times the Italians receive large coal shipments from Germany, mainly by two routes: from Hamburg to Genoa by sea, and by inland waterways through south Germany to Austria and thence by rail to Italian industrial centers. The Allied blockade has put a stop to the ocean coal shipments, and ice-locked rivers and canals have kept German coal from Italian customers. The shortage of coal has slowed down Italian industry and curtailed railway service.

But the war is here, and as long as it lasts, the Duce is going to make the best of the situation. If he can maintain his "non-belligerency" until the proper time, then he might indeed emerge as the sole winner of the war. But that would require astute diplomacy and perfect timing in the moves of his foreign policies. Is he up to it? No one knows.

Premier Daladier, of France, was behind the unheralded trip of Pierre Laval to Rome late last August.

At the beginning of the war many observers believed that Stalin could accomplish the feat of staying out and reaping the profits. But the Russian dictator got bogged down in Finland and lost much of the bargaining power that went with his being Europe's most powerful neutral. That role has been inherited by the Duce. He, too, will have to walk carefully in order to avoid the pitfalls that tripped Josef Stalin.

LET us examine briefly Italy's relations with the various powers or groups of powers. Millions of words have been written about the Italo-German Axis, yet a few Axis principles should be re-emphasized. The Axis was founded on Realpolitik. Friendship did not enter the situation. The Duce and the Fuehrer realized that they could work more successfully as partners than as individuals. Italy and Germany were "have-not" nations. Rome wanted to build an empire in the Mediterranean region; Berlin wanted to create a vast Mitteleuropa. Until last August Italian and German policies with reference to the Soviet Union coincided.

On the other hand there is in Italy a natural fear of Germany. For centuries invading Germans have debouched from the northern passes into the Italian plains. For that reason Italy has long sought some insurance of safety from Germanic invasion. At the end of the World War the Italians gained the strategic frontier at the Brenner Pass and approved the creation of the independent buffer state of Austria. When Austria fell to the Nazis two years ago, field-gray German troops arrived at the northern end of the Brenner. This recurrence of a traditional threat was not good news for Italians. Nor is it reassuring to the Duce to know that some Nazis have openly proclaimed that Trieste is a German city which must be "redeemed." Furthermore, German and Italian economic and diplomatic interests conflict in the Balkans. For the Balkan peninsula is not only "living space" to the Germans; it is also "vital space" to the Italians.

Of recent years Italy's relations with the Western democracies have not been happy. During the Ethiopian crisis Anglo-Italian relations

New York Times

Economically as well as geographically, Italy is in a strategic position to capitalize on her neutrality.

were severely strained. Franco-Italian relations have been almost continuously bad since the World War. Italians believe that the Western democracies betrayed them at the peace settlement and walked out on promises made to Italy in the secret treaties of 1915. Furthermore, Italians have bitterly resented what they have considered French condescension toward their country.

The Duce loves to speak of the Mediterranean as Mare Nostrum. But it is hardly that today. Britain controls two of its outlets, Turkey the third. France holds a long shore line in North Africa and island bases near the Italian mainland. And Britain is entrenched in fortified Malta, scarcely fifty miles from Sicily.

Italy, which was late in achieving national unity, jumped into the race for choice colonies only after most of the valuable sites had been staked out by other countries. Mussolini means to do something about obtaining more colonies. The French colony of Tunis is near the top of his list. Not only does he need this region's raw materials; he wants a further outlet for Italy's surplus population. But he is far too realistic to dream that he could obtain Tunis under any but the most extraordinary circumstances. If Hitler should triumph in the present conflict, Tunis might be the Duce's reward for "non-belligerency." On the other hand, if the Allies find themselves in increasingly desperate straits, France might need Italy's aid so badly that she would even part with Tunis. In the World War the Allies bid for Italian support by promising Italy property that belonged to other nations. This time, if they bid, they will have to offer something that belongs to themselves. And it will have to be more than "a patch of desert."

DESPITE the large amount of anti-Soviet propaganda coming out of Italy, the Duce's relations with Stalin are on an entirely realistic basis. Mussolini loathes Bolshevism, especially when it threatens to permeate Italian spheres of influence. If Stalin intrudes on Italy's interests, the Duce will fight. As long as the Soviet Union confines its activities to strictly Russian spheres Mussolini will do business with it on the same basis as with other nations. In spite of all the trouble between Rome and Moscow over Ethiopia and Spain, their trade relations were not broken.

But when Stalin threatens the Balkans, the Italians sit up and take notice. The Vatican, the House of Savoy and the Fascist Grand Council feel alike about the challenge of Communism in Italy's "vital space." When the *Gazetto del Popolo* of Turin says: "Italy will never permit the further advance of Bolshevist Russia beyond the Carpathians, in the Danube Valley, in the Balkans or toward the Mediterranean," it undoubtedly speaks not only for the Fascist Italians but for the nation as a whole. Rome would not stand by while the Red army attacked Hungary. It is doubtful whether Italy would long stand aside if the Soviet invaded Rumania. Almost at any cost Italy would strive to prevent Russian egress to the Mediterranean. When Italians demonstrate for Finland and shout: "*Abbasso il Communismo!* (Down with Communism!)" they are thinking primarily of the defense of the Balkans. Finland, they believe, has

delayed a Bolshevik thrust into Rumania.

An unexpected development of the war is Germany's attitude toward Italian efforts to help Finland. Before the Nazi-Soviet pact the Reich and Finland were on good terms; the Reich and Italy were Axis allies. Yet when Italy attempted to send some planes across Germany, as a short cut to Finland, they were stopped on Reich territory. Moscow thereupon issued a veiled warning to Berlin not to allow any aid for Finland to cross German soil. Hitler promptly turned back the Italian planes to Italy. A few days later the French censor allowed the news to be sent abroad that Italian planes and volunteers for Finland were being allowed (actually encouraged, of course) to cross France.

WHY, ask Italian political strategists, should Russia threaten our "vital space" in the Balkans? It is not there that Stalin's richest loot lies waiting. Far more valuable booty is to be had in the Middle East: in Iraq, in Iran, in Afghanistan—in India. Rome would be relieved if Moscow's Red imperialism could be deflected from the Balkans toward Britain's life-line in the Middle East. The British then would be compelled to mobilize more of their strength in the Middle East, thereby lessening British naval and military power in the Mediterranean. There have been rumors in Europe recently to the effect that Russia is concentrating a large army for an invasion of the Middle East, massing 700,000 troops on the frontiers of Iran and Afghanistan.

Only a few months ago Italy's relations with Turkey were unfriendly. The Turks suspected the Italians of designs on Smyrna and its hinterland; Italians suspected a Turkish plot to seize the Dodecanese islands. But Stalin's threats to the Balkans have helped to smooth relations between Italy and Turkey, and also between Italy and the other members of the Balkan Entente (Yugoslavia, Greece and Rumania). A few years ago the Slavic minority in Italy and the Italian minority in Yugoslavia threatened trouble between Rome and Belgrade. Now the Duce is moving some of the Italian minority back to Italy. This cooperation is a symptom of the *esprit de corps* that is developing along the once troubled shores of the Adriatic.

De Groene Amsterdammer

Shall Il Duce put on the uniform and work for peace, or, as a pirate, help loot Europe?

But Italy's improved relations with the Balkan countries do not guarantee peace for the Duce's empire; they merely strengthen Mussolini in his diplomatic position and military preparations. On January 7 Signor Ettore Muti, the new Fascist Secretary General, warned his countrymen that they may have to "pick up arms any moment." The *Lavoro Fascista* speaks scornfully of "the very bourgeois love of a quiet life."

Last November the Comintern's manifesto, issued in Moscow, charged that Italy was staying out of the war waiting "to attack whoever is defeated to obtain a share of the loot." That is perhaps a distortion of the case. It would perhaps be more accurate to say that the Duce has no intention of being caught on the losing side. If other nations choose to fight a long, exhausting conflict, say the Fascists, that is not Mussolini's fault. He would be merely following the precedent of democratic nations if he directed his policies toward obtaining some of the imperialistic prizes he cannot hope to gain in time of peace.

Recently Count Ciano's newspaper, the *Telegrafo* of Livorno, said: "In case of a clash with any great outside Mediterranean naval power there is only one final result which is possible, that no nation can today navigate the Mediterranean—a sea created by God for submarine warfare—against the will of Italy." It is certainly true that in a combat in that area Italy's undersea and air fleets could make the position of the Western democracies most difficult.

Meanwhile, the Western democracies have been careful not to take Italy's "non-belligerency" for granted. Not only have French press cam-

paigns against Italy died down, but the British have been far more considerate of Italian maritime rights than of those of some neutrals. This came out rather strikingly in the correspondence between the United States and Britain over the questions of contraband and mails. In a note to Britain, Secretary Hull declared that American shipping to the Mediterranean was held up by the British on an average of 12.4 days. Italian ships, on the other hand, have been detained by Britain's naval control on an average of only four days.

THE longer the war goes on, the higher rises Italy's nuisance value to both Germany and the Allies. The more money and human material is wasted by both sets of combatants, the more Italy's military and naval strength increases in relation to her neighbors. And the longer the conflict goes on, the more certain is the Duce to have a chair near the head of the table at the eventual peace conference. Indeed, if the war drags on its staggeringly costly way to a stalemate, Italy may conceivably be the only great power in Europe to escape economic prostration and social revolution.

The most successful statesman is the one who can gain his objectives without war. Hitler, Stalin—even Chamberlain and Daladier — have been forced to take up arms to gain or hold what they regard as national necessities. The Duce is probably more popular in Italy today than ever before, because in the midst of a warring Europe his nation is the only major power that is a "non-belligerent." As the situation shapes up at this time, Italy may be the only country which is winning the war.

Wheeler and the Liberals

Despite reports of a Wheeler Presidential boom, the Montanan can look to no one large group for support

ROBERT S. ALLEN

(Reports that Senator Burton K. Wheeler was in the front rank of candidates for the Democratic Presidential nomination prompted CURRENT HISTORY *to ask Robert S. Allen, well-known Washington correspondent and author, for a frank appraisal of the Montanan's record, abilities, and potentialities. Mr. Allen was given a free hand; the accompanying represents his own views and not necessarily those of the magazine. —Editor's Note)*

SENATOR BURTON K. WHEELER is a perfect illustration of that inelegant but vivid colloquialism. "He was too slick for his own good."

After outsmarting many and powerful foes for more than two decades, the Montanan, within grasp of the highest honor in the land, suddenly descended to a display of politics that not only destroyed his great prospects but beclouded his standing as a trustworthy liberal champion.

Had he in 1937, when the crucial test came in the historic Supreme Court reform battle, remained true, like Norris, LaFollette, Wagner, LaGuardia and the other liberal leaders, to the principles he had professed for so many years, Wheeler today would be either a member of the Supreme Court or the undeniable successor to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In back of him had been a long and distinguished record as a liberal fighter in national affairs, unquestioned ability, extensive experience, the united support of all labor factions, and powerful standing with the great mass of independent voters. The New Deal inevitably would have turned to him as its standard bearer.

Today, neither the liberals nor the conservatives trust him. Wheeler tried to play both sides and as a result lost the respect and confidence of both. Between him and the liberals exists an unspoken estrangement that is deep and irrevocable. Never again will they feel sure of him. The Tories didn't like him before and despite their approval during the court struggle don't like him today. They too have no confidence in him. They aren't sure he won't turn on them again.

A group of them recently were gossiping about the presidential situation in a Senate cloakroom when the name of Wheeler was mentioned. "He hasn't got a chance," said one. "He hasn't any real footing under him. Roosevelt will never stand for him for what he did and said in the court fight and without Roosevelt's backing he can't get to first base. And we certainly won't make a fight for him. Why should we? We've got plenty of good men of our own."

This realistic observation tells the whole story.

Numerous reasons have been offered why Wheeler torpedoed his promising political future by leading the frontal attack on Roosevelt's Court reform program. Long before the President sent his controversial measure to Congress, Wheeler, as the running mate of "Old Bob" LaFollette in 1924, had advocated "abolition of the tyranny and usurpation of the (Supreme) Court, including the practice of nullifying legislation in conflict with the political, social or economic theories of the judges." Why the sudden shift from this really radical stand to opposition to Roosevelt's moderate proposal?

Probably there is no single reason for Wheeler's dramatic somersault. His action can only be understood when viewed against the perspective of his character and career.

Wheeler's early life reads like a typical American success story. Born in 1882 in Hudson, Mass., he attended grammar school and business college there. Working as a clerk and stenographer, he saved enough to enroll in the Michigan law school at Ann Arbor, where he waited on table in a boarding house and did clerical work in the Dean's office. Summer vacations found him tramping through the Illinois countryside, selling an all-purpose volume of household advice. One day he called at a farm near Albany and met Lulu M. White, who later became Mrs. Wheeler.

He graduated from law school in 1905 and worked for three months in a Colorado law office. Starting out

Incubation Season

Kansas City Star

Wheeler as Candidate

Three days after the following article by Ludwell Denny appeared in The New York World-Telegram, *Senator Wheeler told reporters he would not enter any Presidential primary in which President Roosevelt was a candidate. He said he "expected to be for any liberal Democrat" and would do nothing which might split up "the liberal and Progressive forces of this country."—Editor's Note.*

If Mr. Farley is right in his renewed certainty that President Roosevelt will not be a third-term candidate, then the Democrat to watch is Senator Wheeler.

The position of every other candidate has been weakened by the hide-and-seek tactics of the President, who can get the nomination for himself if he wants it. Burt Wheeler is the only field candidate stronger today than a month ago.

Whether Mr. Farley is correct in his assumption that the President won't run, however, is a very big if. Most Washington politicians are not sure. It is generally admitted that the President is acting like a candidate, whatever he may or may not have told the Democratic National Chairman.

The concensus here is that the President is working hard and successfully for a "draft Roosevelt" convention in case he does decide to run. But there is no agreement as to what his decision will be.

Some, at least, of those closest to the President are convinced he has not decided. They think that if the convention were tomorrow he would not run. But the changing foreign situation, which fascinates him almost to the exclusion of everything else, could easily convince him of his "duty" to remain in the White House. His dispatch of Undersecretary of State Welles to Europe as his personal roving representative is not unconnected with this.

So—despite Mr. Farley's entry in the Massachusetts Presidential primary on the reported assurance of the President that a third term is out—Washington still thinks that a Roosevelt renomination is a 50-50 bet.

Senator Wheeler is the second-best bet after the President. This is not because the White House has picked him as crown prince. Indeed, Mr. Wheeler's chief weakness is that he is not high on the Roosevelt preferential list. But the President's anger at the Senator for leading the successful fight against his Supreme Court plan has cooled. Recently there was a cordial meeting of the two at the White House.

Mr. Wheeler's chances are based on the probability that the convention (if the President decides not to run) will be deadlocked between New Dealers and Garnercrats, and that a compromise candidate must be named. Although the President can name himself he cannot name either of his favorites, Attorney General Jackson or Supreme Court Justice Douglas. But he will have veto power, with his tacit threat to walk out on the campaign "unless."

If there is any certainty it is that Mr. Roosevelt will veto the Garner candidacy. Even if the President did not have such strong feelings on this subject, it is unlikely that "Cactus Jack" could be nominated and even less likely that he could be elected.

But Mr. Garner will control a large bloc of delegates. He may have balance of power—as he had when he threw the 1932 nomination to Mr. Roosevelt.

Thus, if a compromise candidate is chosen, the three men who will do the picking—along with a few state machine bosses like Hague and Kelly—will be these: Roosevelt, Garner and Farley. And the picking, if it were today, would be among Secretary Hull, Administrator McNutt and Senator Wheeler.

Chairman Farley would name Mr. Hull. The President probably would agree, but the Vice President would oppose Hull.

Mr. Roosevelt might name Mr. McNutt. Anyway, Chairman Farley would try to veto him.

Then probably the Vice President would name Senator Wheeler. There is no evidence now that either the President or Mr. Farley would make a last-ditch fight against him. Possibly by that time the President might be the first to support him.

The reason for Burt Wheeler's growing strength as a compromise candidate (if the third term is out) is not money or organization —he has neither. It is because he is trusted by both liberals and conservatives, labor and capital.

to look for a good town in which to hang out his shingle, he stopped in Butte, Montana, lost all his money in a poker game and decided to settle down and earn some more. He did. He rapidly made a name for himself as a lawyer and was elected to the State Legislature in 1910. The record shows that during his first session he voted generally with the conservatives.

Wheeler, however, soon sensed the strong liberal undercurrent among Montana voters. He came under the influence of the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, idol of the rank and file.

Walsh, friendly to Wheeler, extended him public recognition by recommending him for United States District Attorney. War came. As elsewhere it brought labor troubles, spy scares, charges and countercharges. Wheeler's office was deluged with demands for mass arrests. But guided by the older liberals, chief among them Federal Judge George M. Bourquin, he refused to be swept off his feet. Pressure then was turned on Walsh who finally wired Wheeler to come to Washington.

WHEELER showed the message to one of his closest associates. The friend warned him Walsh would probably advise him to resign. "I may be put out of office, but I will never resign," Wheeler replied. Five days later, however, he decided to quit.

Two years later, in 1920, he was nominated for Governor by organized farmers and workers, who admired him for refusing to countenance mass prosecutions during the war hysteria. Wheeler was defeated by a huge slush fund and one of the most vicious campaigns of vilification in the history of the state.

In 1922 Wheeler again ran for office, this time for the Senate, and surprisingly with no real opposition from his former enemies.

Some have charged that Wheeler came to an understanding with the economic hierarchy, agreeing not to run for Governor or intervene in State affairs if he could go to Washington. Others say there was no deal; that the powerful corporate interests merely were glad to have him out of the State for six years. At any rate, he was elected without a serious contest.

In the national Capitol Wheeler soon became known as a militant crusader. His exposure of some of the

graft and corruption of the Harding regime helped force Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty out of office. The notorious Ohio gang retaliated by sending federal detectives to Montana to indict Wheeler for practicing law in behalf of a private client before a government department. Wheeler yelled "frame-up" and, with Walsh as his counsel, was acquitted by a jury on the first ballot that was returned.

In 1924, Wheeler ran with LaFollette and one of the main planks in their Progressive platform was reform of the Supreme Court. The ticket lost but during the subsequent doldrums of the Republican heyday, Wheeler was one of the most militant dissidents in Congress.

"I don't want to be rescued if I can't be captain."

Critics have attributed Wheeler's opposition to the court bill to strictly political motivations. They have pointed out that he recognized the powerful forces aligned against the measure and realized the tremendous publicity that would go to a liberal who suddenly became the leader of these forces. That explanation may be partly correct, but in fairness to him two things must be remembered: He declared himself against the bill shortly after it was proposed, before much opposition had become evident, and he had been growing increasingly bitter toward the President for several years.

This hatred can be traced back to the Spring of 1932, when, after conferences with Roosevelt at Albany, he toured the West, lining up votes for the approaching Chicago convention. In return for his work, Wheeler built up fond hopes of being Roosevelt's running mate. How Garner traded himself into the vice-presidency with the aid of William Gibbs McAdoo and William Randolph Hearst is history.

Wheeler was sorely disappointed but he believed he had another chance when his old friend Tom Walsh died a few days before taking office as Attorney General. Wheeler, and particularly his wife, felt very strongly that he was entitled to the place. But again he was left out in the cold. To say that he was irked when the post went to Homer Cummings is to put it mildly.

After this followed a long series of irritations and patronage difficulties.

Wheeler's support was the crucial assession for the reactionary opposition. Without him they could not have garroted the bill. He supplied them with the one thing they desperately needed—competent leadership. An astute and agile strategist, he has few equals in resourcefulness and demagoguery and he became the Administration's nemesis.

Characteristic of his tactics, Wheeler, while secretly collaborating with the worst reactionary elements, publicly attacked the court bill as "too reactionary." Forgetting his former championship of judicial reform, he denounced the President's plan as a Tory scheme to acquire dictatorial power.

As soon as the court bill was buried, Wheeler hurried out to Montana to explain his action to his constituents. He stumped the State assuring the voters he had not turned his back on the liberal cause.

The inability of the voters to forget overnight militated against the glibness of Wheeler's explanations. For years he had told them: "When you see my name on the front page of the corporation papers you will know that I have sold out." After his leadership of the reactionary forces during the court fight, his picture and name have become a fixture on the corporation press of Montana.

Wheeler has been a lonely man since the historic struggle. His liberal colleagues have never taken him back into their fold. On the other hand, his new conservative pals secretly don't trust him either. Wheeler's attitude is a queer mixture of defiance and dejection as he moves, usually alone, through the Senate chamber. His votes are generally recorded for liberal measures, although his opposition to one important bill last year became a source of embarrassment to his long-time friend John L. Lewis a few weeks ago.

Lewis apparently didn't read the United Mine Workers report before it was released at the Columbus convention. One paragraph of the report bitterly denounced the "reactionary cabal" that defeated the New Deal spend-lend bill last Summer. Wheeler was one of the leading opponents of the measure.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

The defects of this giant project seem to this observer to outweigh the apparent advantages

CHARLES L. RAPER

Dean of the College of Business Administration, Syracuse University

THE proposed seaway through the St. Lawrence River to Chicago and other important Great Lakes cities, it is estimated, will cost the United States government several hundred million dollars. The history of the actual cost of inland waterway developments and improvements, in this country and in several European countries, indicates that, generally, the actual cost has been two to three times the estimated cost.

The need for such a carrier-way by our shippers and receivers of freight has been represented as very important. What are the facts?

Twenty years ago, goods could move from the Great Lakes area to our eastern seaboard—for consumption in the east or for shipment to Europe—only by railroad or by lake or river steamer to Buffalo or to Montreal. Now, in addition to these carriers, we have several trunk highways connecting the Great Lakes area and the seaboard: and over these moves a very large traffic.

Twenty years ago, there was real fear of a shortage of transportation, as a result of our war experiences, when all the available vessels operating on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence down to Montreal had been drawn into war service. Soon after these vessels were returned to regular lake or river service, the railroads expanded their facilities in a large way; and motor carriers became increasingly numerous and active. Competition for the available traffic became greater and greater. The problem today is how the existing carriers operating in this region can be sustained on the existing traffic—not how additional transportation facilities may be provided.

Twenty years ago, there was an important flow of wheat from Minnesota and the Dakotas to our eastern seaboard for local consumption or for export to Europe. Today, Kansas and its neighboring sections to the south have come to be our great wheat producing area. Wheat produced in this area would not move to Europe by the St. Lawrence sea-going vessels. And too, Europeans are not buying wheat so largely from the United States as they did twenty years ago.

Here, then, are several obvious weaknesses in the St. Lawrence waterway proposal. There are many others.

Ocean steamers, in order to yield profits to their owners, generally must travel at their designed speeds. Such vessels can do so on the ocean and in the lower St. Lawrence. They could not do so in the upper St. Lawrence however much might be expended in improving the channel.

Existing harbor facilities at Great Lakes ports are adequate for the economical operation of vessels designed for the Great Lakes. Large expenditures on these facilities would be necessary if they were to be used for steamers designed to make profits out of operation on the ocean.

Inbound cargo, as well as outbound cargo, would be necessary for profitable operation of ocean steamers

moving to Chicago and upper Great Lakes ports. The demand for such inbound cargo does not now exist and probably will not exist for many years to come, unless we make a radical change in our policy of tariff protection to our existing industries.

The fact that profitable use of the proposed waterway demands large inbound cargo, even at ballast rates, has several implications. If we subsidize the St. Lawrence outbound traffic, we cannot escape subsidizing the inbound traffic.

We are now shipping annually about 10,000,000 tons of our coal to Canada. The proposed ocean waterway would mean a large movement of coal from Nova Scotia, Great Britain, Russia, etc., at ballast rates—to displace our coal, which is produced under conditions of high wages, with coal produced elsewhere at lower wages. The same thing might be done with crude or fuel oil.

PROPONENTS of the St. Lawrence ocean waterway claim for it the development of many million tons of traffic; and they also claim substantial savings in freight rates. The outbound freight would, however, come from a territory already adequately supplied with transportation facilities. The private investments in the railroads of this territory and the public investments in the highways and existing waterways amount to very large figures. In this territory, the taxpayers have very large investments in the New York State Barge Canal, the Ohio River, the Illinois Waterway, the upper Mississippi River, and the Missouri River. Traffic diverted from these private and public carriers would make the investments in them less fruitful.

To summarize, then: the proposed waterway would take outbound traffic from our private and public carriers and tend to destroy their invest-

Christian Science Monitor

Six years ago the United States Senate barely failed to ratify the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty between this country and Canada. This year the $530,000,000 project is being advocated again, with full administration support, and the Senate will again decide for or against it.

The central plan of the St. Lawrence Waterway is to provide a twenty-seven foot channel around or through obstructions now blocking direct access to the Atlantic from the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes themselves can accommodate large ships but the St. Clair and Niagara Rivers, and the rapids between Lakes Superior and Michigan, are too shallow for direct passage. Under the St. Lawrence Waterway project, access would be provided for ocean-going vessels to inland ports such as Toronto, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and Duluth.

The Waterway would be built through Canadian and American territory. Its length would be 1,677 miles from the head of the Great Lakes to Father Point, where the St. Lawrence joins the Atlantic. Average voyage time would be five and one-half days. The project would be made to develop a great deal of electrical energy.

Spirited controversy has raged around this proposed St. Lawrence Waterway. In this article, Dean Raper explains why he takes his stand with the waterway's opponents.

---

ments; it would also bring to us cheap foreign goods as inbound traffic at ballast rates, and thereby strike at our makers of important products, and if it should secure the traffic its proponents claim for it, the result would be irreparable damage to our investments—public as well as private—and to our workmen.

Now let us consider the hydroelectric aspect of the St. Lawrence project. It is claimed that a minimum of 1,100,000 horse power of electrical energy would be produced in the international rapids section of the waterway for use in the United States. This would be the equivalent of approximately 5,000,000 tons of our coal. Each million ton of our coal displaced cuts $2,000,000 annually from the gross revenue of our coal producers, and 60 per cent of this sum is paid in wages. Each million ton of our coal displaced also reduces our railroad freight revenues by at least $2,000,000, of which forty-four per cent is paid in wages.

In the near future, furthermore, hydro plants will face important competition from the new high temperature high pressure steam boiler and engine and from the Diesel engine. The hydro plant projected for the St. Lawrence will prove no exception.

The new steam plant can produce much more electrical energy out of the same amount of coal than the old type of steam plant; and it can be located where its output is consumed, thereby eliminating the large cost involved in the transmission of energy from the hydro plant to distant points of consumption. The Diesel engine, which also can be located at the point of consumption, will probably produce at a lower delivered cost than that of a hydro plant when the latter's electrical energy is transmitted over long distances. The loss in transmission is always great unless a very large investment is put into copper for the transmission lines.

It is possible to do tricks with bookkeeping to show that the St. Lawrence project can produce electrical energy cheaply, but they remain tricks nevertheless. Our government should stop producing electrical energy on any other basis than that of the sum total of all the items of cost—obsolescence as well as operation, interest on all the investment, amortization, depreciation, and an offset against state and local taxes. If all these items were included, the so-called yardstick of hydroelectrical energy cost would be much larger than it is at present. It would, I think,

(Continued on page 57)

Bureaucracy Rules the Navy

Absence of a general staff, this expert contends, seriously imperils the value of our naval forces

ADMIRAL YATES STIRLING
Author of "Sea Power"

SOMETHING'S wrong with the Navy. You hear it everywhere, in newspaper reports, in discussion groups, in the questions people ask of lecturers. In Congress, the talk has burst into the open with charges that the Navy has wasted millions of dollars on warships which have structural defects. Implied in all these reports and charges is the allegation that the Navy is laboring under the handicap of large-scale inefficiency, which, unless immediately eliminated, will imperil the value of our naval forces at a time when they can least afford to be weakened.

Is there any foundation for such reports? If so, where should the responsibility be placed? What can or should be done?

I think I can speak with some authority on the subject. I have been part of the Navy for more than forty years. I have been able to observe its development both from the inside as a commanding officer and from the outside as a civilian. On the basis of my observations and the facts at hand I think I am in a position to state that something definitely *is* wrong with the Navy. I think, too, that once the source of the trouble is recognized and corrected our fighting naval forces may be expected to operate at their greatest potential strength.

First of all, let us consider the most important of the charges brought before Congress. Twelve destroyers representing a total investment of $85,200,000, it is claimed, have been found unseaworthy as the result of top-heavy construction. Aircraft carriers were said to have been built with expensive new steel gas fuel tanks which leaked so badly they had to be replaced with tried and proven galvanized iron. There was a drastic and inexplicable increase in the costs of naval building, from battleships whose costs have increased tenfold per ship during the last twenty years to tugboats whose costs are easily twice as high as those of best tugboats built anywhere in private shipyards.

Little wonder that Congressmen, who had just given the Navy $758,000,000 for its 1940 program, became uneasy over what the taxpaying constituents back home might think of the judiciousness of the entire appropriation, to say nothing of how these disclosures might undermine public confidence in what is certainly our first line of defense.

There can be no question concerning the validity of these charges. They were substantiated beyond a reasonable doubt. But very little was said about the causes for such careless planning and inefficiency. I am convinced today—just as I was convinced during American participation in the World War, when the Navy was similarly faced with serious charges of inefficiency—that the core of the Navy's trouble is—and always has been—its complicated and cemented bureaucracy. Like all bureaucratic systems, it grows worse with the years. Mistakes are never brought into the open for airing or correction but are perpetuated under a blanket of silence and self-righteousness thicker than the thickest steel plates on the new battleships. The Navy, moreover, is not one bureaucracy but a series of bureaucracies, each of which is rigidly separated from the other and operates

in the solar system of the naval hierarchy as a world of its own, each with its own axis and its own orbit. There are connecting ties, to be sure, but it must be recognized that these ties come off the same spool of red tape.

Every important country in the world except the United States has learned after sufficient trial and error that the administration of a Navy should proceed along essentially the same lines as that of an army. In other words, armies operate most efficiently through their general staffs and it has been established that the same holds true for navies. And yet the instituting of a General Staff for the United States Navy has been quashed every time the idea has been put forth.

I am not suggesting that the United States adopt the general staff idea merely because other nations have proved it successful. I think it should be installed because it is the only way we can avoid such inexcusable blunders as were brought to light in the disclosures before Congress. And even more important is the crying need not only to break down the walls of isolation separating all the individual bureaucracies but to clean out the bureaucratic systems themselves. This a general staff can do. It would take over the authorities vested departmentally and centralize them in a body of qualified men.

No one will question the need today for our Navy to operate at its maximum efficiency and to be in a position to fight at its greatest potential strength in the event it should be put to the test. And yet it is my painful duty to state that if that test comes the Navy will be seriously handicapped by a lack of coordination that can not be remedied except through the setting up of a general staff. This general staff will mean the difference between uncoordinated navies (there are nine bureaus, each of which might be called a little navy

of its own) and a unified Navy, whose efforts will not be dissipated through internal wrangling but can be consolidated in a compact fighting unit.

In the most general terms, the organization of the Navy Department consists of the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary, the Chief of Naval Operations and his staff, the Navy General Board—together with nine bureaus of the Navy Department. Broadly speaking, these nine bureaus are responsible for the provision of all material for naval use, including the finished weapons of naval warfare and the personnel to use effectively such material.

In other words, the bureaus supply warships, hulls, engines, guns, armor, navy yards, dry docks and repair shops, pay, clothing, food, etc., as well as human material—officers and men. The bureaus also supervise the education, training, discipline and health of these men.

Between the two great functions of these bureaus—the supplying of men and the supplying of materials—there exists at present a wide chasm over which there is no perfectly workable bridge. Absent is sympathetic coordination for the great mission of the Navy: the creation of naval power.

So notorious within the Navy itself have the bureaucracies of the Navy become that one frequently hears quips of this nature:

"Why is a bureau of the Navy Department like a woman?"

The answer is:

"Because the bureau always has the last word."

The bureaus never are wrong and no one knows that fact better than the Navy.

In addition to the two functions I have mentioned before, there is still a third function or activity of even greater importance: the correct use of weapons in accordance with plans carefully worked out for execution both in peace and in war. This is what is sometimes called "the art of war." This third function is the responsibility of the Chief of Naval Operations, the highest ranking naval officer in the Navy, his staff, and the General Board (a body of ranking admirals).

There can be only minor criticism of the experience, knowledge, loyalty and quality of the personnel occupying these important positions. We must not close our eyes, however, to complaints, heard in increasing volume—that this set-up is defective in efficiency, completeness, prestige and permanency.

Top-heavy construction of destroyers, it is charged, has resulted in a loss to the Navy of millions of dollars.

In all important navies, except our own, and in all armies, this third and crowning function in naval organization is performed by a body of highly trained officers called the General Staff, who are relieved of all routine or administrative duties, and who are entrusted with the complicated preparation of the Navy for war in all its many ramifications.

Several times the subject of providing a legalized General Staff for the Navy has been before the Congress. Among its strongest advocates was the late Admiral W. S. Sims, who commanded our naval forces in Europe during the World War. But all attempts have failed, principally because of the determined opposition of the nine bureaus, reinforced with the opposition of expediency-conscious politicians.

The principal argument against the formation of a General Staff for the Navy is that the present organization constitutes a General Staff in everything but name. Yet as the size of the Navy increases and the multiplicity of its duties expands, it becomes increasingly evident that the omission is both unscientific and costly. There exists what might almost be called a vicious cycle operating to block the needed reform. Naval legislation must be obtained from the Congress, and that body naturally looks to the Navy to express its wishes. No sooner is a suggestion of this nature put forward than all of the nine bureaus put their individual and collective thumbs down. These bureaus are the last place anyone would look for the voluntary surrender of privilege and prerogative. Even the officer personnel of the Navy do not see clearly the need of this vital organ at the top of naval organization.

Many have asked for a definition of a General Staff, and want to have its duties explained. There is nothing mysterious in the basic idea. The same principle exists, but under different names, in all successful businesses.

The French have three words to define the gamut of the functions of a General Staff. They are:

Savoir (to know); *vouloir* (to wish); and *pouvoir* (to be able).

In *knowing* of the strength of an enemy and of our own forces to oppose him, a *wish* for action can become a logical plan of operations, only when the means are available to make us *able*.

The creation of a General Staff, under a Chief of the General Staff, has for its ideal the creation of a

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY CHARLES A. EDISON, in one of his first major moves since assuming his cabinet post, has advised the Chairman of the House Naval Affairs committee that "the time is ripe" for making long needed improvements in Navy Department organization. The Secretary recommended a basis for reorganization which he said should be "adopted and implemented either by Presidential Executive order, under his reorganization powers, or by act of Congress at this session."

Mr. Edison's recommendations were contained in a letter to Chairman Carl Vinson in response to a request from the latter for "frank and candid" opinions on the Chairman's bill to reorganize the Navy Department and to establish a single promotion list.

The letter expressed gratification that Chairman Vinson is "so evidently desirous of improving a state of affairs that has needed improvement for many years." He said that the need for a coordinating officer for the industrial and material activities is "sound common sense," but added that he already has taken steps toward combining the Bureau of Construction and Repair and the Bureau of Engineering. However, further action will be required to complete the consolidation, he added.

Secretary Edison

The time is ripe, the Secretary said, for making modifications in the offices of the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary, the Chief of Operations, and the Director of Shore Establishments.

Secretary Edison's proposed plan would provide him with three assistants: An Assistant Secretary to aid in the "realm of general duties"; the Chief of Naval Operations "in the realm of military and fleet operations"; and the Chief of Shore Operations in shipbuilding, civilian, and other shore establishment matters. The Chief of Shore Operations, Mr. Edison says, could be either a civilian or a naval officer. If a civilian, he says, he would precede the Chief of Operations in succession to the Secretary and Assistant Secretary, while if he were a naval officer he would hold the temporary rank of admiral and follow the Chief of Operations.—From *The Army and Navy Journal.*

collective mind—many minds in thought processes and in action fully coordinated with the mind of the leader. This the leader achieves through indoctrination of his staff officers in his ideals, his policies, his character, his methods. Each General Staff officer thus becomes an integral part of the mind of his chief. Their eyes are his eyes. In such an organization no cross purposes can exist. The leader virtually finds himself everywhere there is a General Staff officer.

Policies are the function of the leader. The details by which policies are woven into a plan of action belong to the individuals composing the collective mind of the chief: the officers of the General Staff.

WHEN war comes, unless we have experienced, trained officers of the General Staff to interpret and guide each of the many details of the plan in their proper sequence, there will be chaos instead of order at a time when the most expert and efficient direction is needed. Reduced to its simplest terms, therefore, a General Staff furnishes the leader with helpmates similar to himself in calibre and outlook.

Modeled along the lines of the Army General Staff plan of organization, the naval organization could be accomplished without seriously disturbing the proper function of the bureaus of the Navy Department, except to divorce them of their assumed character of independent corporations. The General Staff, as I see it, would include:

(1) *Personnel Division:*—Would take over function now performed by the Bureau of Navigation.

(2) *Naval Intelligence Division:*—Would be created from the present office of Naval Intelligence.

(3) *Operations and Training Division:*—A naval war fought in either the Atlantic or Pacific or both could not be confined to any definite area. There will be the Battle Fleet, the Scouting Fleet, Base and Control Forces, Escorting Forces and detachments sent here and there to meet an enemy threat. The composition and general direction of all forces engaged would be the duty of this division. It would be comprised of three branches: (a) Operations, (b) Training, (c) Mobilization. The administration of these functions is now performed by bureaus and offices. All that would be required are coordination and supervision by General Staff Officers assigned to this division.

(4) *Supply Division:*—The branches of this division would be: (a) Finance, (b) Construction, (c) Supply and Transportation, (d) Planning and Equipment. General Staff Officers would be assisted by officers of the staff corps who have necessary technical knowledge in all the activities concerned. Staff corps officers would be detailed as members of the General Staff for their particular specialty.

(5) *War Plans Division:*—Would coordinate the Army and Navy war plans with the war plans for the civilian populations.

THE thing most to be emphasized in the idea of a General Staff is its permanency. I do not regard the General Staff as an immediate cure-all for the Navy's assorted ills. What I do contend is that a General Staff will give us the machinery with which a constructive attack on these ills may be brought about. Once the bureaucracies are replaced with an integrated leadership I think it safe to say that we will have eliminated the source of the danger and that we will have at last begun to travel in the right direction.

The Civilian Can Take It

Like the first plunge into a cold lake, war for civilians is a shock which gradually wears off

BERNARD POSTAL

MAN'S unique facility for adapting himself and his way of life to the most rigorous and bizarre conditions was never better illustrated than in London, Paris and Berlin at this moment. There the civilian populations are accustoming themselves to changes touching virtually every aspect of their daily life, as they meet new circumstances and problems arising from the war.

Eating habits were the first to feel the effects of war; ration cards were dealt out almost as soon as hostilities began. In Germany, where there were food restrictions even before the war, rationing has been extended to all basic necessities of life. Separate cards are required for bread, flour, meats, fats, marmalade, sugar, general provisions, produce, poultry, and skimmed milk. Even children, nursing mothers and pregnant women are not exempt, although they are allowed to go to the head of queques in front of food stores.

To circumvent the difficulties of rationing, resourceful hausfraus have developed a flourishing barter system. When a store to which a shopper is assigned for food runs out of a desired item, she trades with a friend in another neighborhood where it is available. Fraudulent ration cards have also made their appearance.

The war has even caught up with animals, for horses, cows, pigs and poultry must have cards before they can approach the feed trough. Animals in the zoo are also feeling the pinch. Peanuts for elephants are taboo, as are bananas for monkeys. Hunters have been mobilized to shoot small game to add to the food supply.

In the beginning, food rationing in England was limited to butter, bacon, meat and sugar, but further restrictions are in prospect. Ration swapping is becoming common. One newspaper carried this advertisement: "Orthodox Jewess, sweet-toothed, wishes introduction for shopping, swapping bacon for sugar." Meat-rationing gave an English fishing tackle dealer an idea for attracting customers. He posted a sign in front of his shop reading: "Meat rationing—take up fishing now." Because of a shortage of barley for animal feeding, supplies to brewers may be reduced, which means that the British beer supply is threatened. Rationing has not yet been introduced in France but there a cup of coffee is a delicacy, and Mondays and Fridays are meatless days.

While housewives are being told what they may put on the dining table, the whole family is being told what it may put on its back. Every German has a yearly ration of clothes, in the form of coupons totalling 100 points. A raincoat represents 50 points; a suit of long underwear, 20; five handkerchiefs, 10; a woolen dress, 40; a blouse, 15. But even with this ration, it is difficult to buy new clothing. On the back of coupons applicants must state what garments they already possess. Officials may visit them in their homes to verify these particulars. If clothing on hand is good enough to repair, the coupons are not honored. In the making of new garments, old clothes are used as much as possible. To save cloth, men's trousers are being made with only one hip pocket, instead of the customary two.

Punch, London

"Mrs. Jones has a new gas-mask carrier, dear . . . ."

Rationing restrictions on clothing had been relaxed in families in which deaths occurred; mourning attire could be purchased on presentation of a death certificate. Then it was discovered that many persons were borrowing death certificates from friends and stocking up on all kinds of black clothing. Merchants must now stamp death certificates when a reasonable amount of clothing has been bought.

Fashion rationing has also been invoked in Britain where the ladies now have only 10 colors to choose from in buying stockings, as compared to 600 shades before the war. Kilts have been banned as a war measure; they take too much wool and are poor protection against poison gas.

These food and clothing restrictions are being received with good grace but deterrents to personal cleanliness have met with widespread grumbling. To reduce coal consumption, Germany has ordered houseowners to limit the hot water supply of tenants to Friday and Saturday, thus curtailing bathing. When German housewives complained about the shortage of soap, the Nazi press published lengthy articles on how to get the most out of one's soap allotment. Among the suggestions are kitchen wash basins filled with suds for family hand-washing; putting soap scraps into a bag and using the bag for washing; eating off bare tables to prevent the soiling of linen; and using water in which ivy leaves have been boiled. Milady is constantly urged to take "air baths" to save soap.

The family automobile has been relegated to the garage because of restrictions on the use of gasoline and the need of special permits for vehicles. No automobile may be driven in Germany except on ap-

proved business. To buy a new car, a German must get approval of the commissioner of traffic. Car-owners lucky enough to obtain permits have to operate their cars on various ersatz gases contained in steel bottles carried under the car. Many German bus routes have been discontinued to conserve gasoline. In England one sees large gas bags atop motor vehicles; the bags hold the equivalent in coal gas of half a gallon of gasoline. Anthracite-burning gas generators are also being used in trailer or car-mounted units to provide fuel.

Evacuation of millions of people, especially children, from urban to rural areas brought a host of changes in the daily routine of civilian populations. City-bred children and their mothers found themselves billeted in the country in the homes of farmers and squires. Friction between city mothers and billet householders; breakdowns in rural water supplies and sanitary conveniences; outcroppings of class and social differences between the city people and their hosts—these were some of the problems that required adjustment.

The removal of civilian population from danger zones was paralleled by a movement of London and Paris business offices to the safety of the countryside. Valuable records were shifted to suburban branches. So widespread was the transfer of business offices from city to country that England declared a one-day holiday to facilitate the change. The war has also altered hours and wages, as well as working conditions. France jacked up working hours to 60 per week and allotted a part of overtime pay for the relief of families of men at the front. In Germany, wages were cut, hours of work increased, vacations cancelled and pay for overtime ended.

Religion and family life too have felt the impact of war. Many French churches have been forced to close because so many priests have been mobilized. German church officials have been instructed not to permit more persons to attend services than can be accommodated in each church's air raid shelters. Night services have been forbidden. Because church bells have been found to impair the efficiency of the listening apparatus of anti-aircraft batteries, in all German areas guarded by anti-aircraft guns church bells may be rung for only three minutes at a time. On Sunday bells may be rung only once, for the main service.

Weddings have been made easier in France. The two weeks' posting of banns is no longer required and all red tape has been eliminated. Men in service can now be married in absentia. Proxy weddings for soldiers have also been approved in Germany, where wedding rings must be of steel instead of gold. Prospective German mothers were the subject of a special decree requesting them to have their babies at home instead of in hospitals and clinics, because hospital beds must be kept at the disposal of the armed forces. A special regulation of the British War Office grants British women enrolled in the civilian defense forces "leave on compassionate grounds when their husbands are on leave from the armed forces." French and British hotels are offering special rates to soldiers and their war brides.

The civilian populations in the warring nations have manifested great ingenuity in circumventing the annoyances and dangers of blacked-out cities. That these risks are real is indicated by an official report showing Britain's heaviest casualties have resulted from blackout traffic mishaps, which accounted for most of the 4,133 deaths in highway accidents during the first four months of the war. During the same period, Britain's naval, army and air forces fatalities totalled 2,511. The situation has been so critical that relaxation of the blackout is being seriously considered. Already a new lighting system has been tried out in London to increase visibility for pedestrians without inviting air raids. Blackouts caused so many bus and trolley accidents in Berlin that many routes were discontinued and others put on curtailed schedules.

Angriff, Berlin

"Might I ask you to let me have your shaving soap coupon?"

The menace to life and limb that lurks in darkened streets has brought into use as blackout fashions a red reflector worn on a white belt as a tail-light; white bands encircling the head; white cuffs attached by studs to the bottoms of evening clothes; white hatbands, sticks and belts; all-white ensembles; a flashlight with a blue-shaded lens built into a derby hat; a dicky of shiny white oilcloth or patent leather that goes over the head; and bracelets, anklets and garters with tinkling bells.

Berlin's blackouts have enriched manufacturers of small buttons bearing radioactive material that shines in the darkness. The phosphorescent buttons and brooches now widely worn by pedestrians out after dark create the effect of fireflies flitting about the streets. An inventive German has made a gadget for lighting keyholes in blacked-out doorways. Berlin traffic policemen on unlighted highways protect themselves by wearing coats, hats and gloves impregnated with phosphorescent material that fluoresces in the dark.

The "blackout blues" ended for London suburbanites when the railroads equipped car windows with metal curtains which prevent even a glimmer of light from showing to an enemy plane. Now the tired business man homeward bound can once more read his paper. Nevertheless, the British newspapers continue to publish hints on how to avoid letting light through doorways even for a brief moment when the door is opened. A silver lining in the blackouts is the fact that cities without street lighting are saving substantial sums in electric bills.

Criminal elements have not been slow to take advantage of the blackouts. In fact, Germany is suffering from a blackout crime wave. There, as in England and France, crimes committed during blackouts are severely punished.

Famed for her style-consciousness, Paris has adapted women's fashions to the war motif. Iridescent flowers or artificial flowers with tiny electric bulbs concealed in them are now in favor for evening wear. Swagger sticks in which are hidden electric torches; fancy purses designed with

convenient pockets and compartments for chocolate bars, a small thermos, identification papers and other war time essentials; air-raid shelter suits and raincoats fashioned out of rubberized materials to make them gasproof are other war-time fashions.

London's Mayfair put on a fashion show featuring a blackout dinner gown and ensembles with military names, the most popular of which was the "soldier boy" suit. Exigencies of war calling for coiffures that can be worn under the uniform caps of the women's auxiliary forces have created new hair-dressing styles. Even rouge, powder, lipstick and finger nail polish have been re-designed to offset the lugubrious illumination which is milady's protection. Luminous rouge that remains the same shade in any kind of light is Paris' answer to the problem of how to keep lips red in the dark.

Ailments born of the war are affecting civilians, and, incidentally, proving a boon to beauty specialists and doctors. London and Paris beauty experts are curing "gas mask shoulder." Most women carry their gas mask cases slung over the left shoulder. After a time that causes a slight stiffness and a hunching of the shoulders. Beauticians are prescribing a series of mild exercises which, coupled with massage, are said to remove the stiffness.

"Must be dangerous back home."

GERMAN doctors have recommended that more brown bread be eaten to cure blackout blindness, which has resulted in a large number of accidents. Brown bread is said to contain a high percentage of Vitamin A, which is supposed to enable the human eye to see better in semi-darkness. Doctors in the warring countries are also swamped by victims of "blackout nerves." This ailment is characterized by severe headaches, similar to those in neuralgia and eye strain. Medical men say the pains are caused by anxiety over the war and eye straining during the unlighted nights. Following the discovery of the harmful effects of gas masks on eye makeup, many women have abandoned the use of mascara for the duration of the war. The heat inside the mask, it was found, causes mascara to run.

The ubiquitous gas mask has been given many an unusual twist, and the air raid shelters have been put to unlooked for uses. Two-year-olds in London have been furnished with "Mickey Mouse" masks because the ordinary respirators frightened them. The "Mickey Mouse" mask has two separate eye pieces and a small protruding piece of rubber for a nose. Bearded gentlemen who found it difficult to wear gas masks are indebted to a Cornishman who thought of rolling his whiskers up tightly with curling pins and tucking them under his chin, thus enabling the mask to be drawn over the face, beard and all. For those who demand fancy gas masks, Paris and London shops offer them in color. One establishment advertises a fur muff especially fitted to hold a gas mask.

Because the public air raid and gas raid shelters bar pets, manufacturers of gas proof kennels and of masks designed for dogs have found a ready market. In the early days of the war, thousands of dogs, cats, birds and other pets were killed by the Royal Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals at the request of owners unable to care for them. Fearing an increase of rats and mice, the Society later issued a plea to owners to keep their pets as long as possible.

The omnipresent air raid shelters, intended to serve as retreats for civilians when enemy bombers soar overhead, have been discovered by cooing couples to be cosy places for trysting. Discouraged air raid wardens in London report they are spending much time interrupting lovemakers.

European advertisers are combing the vocabulary of war for new slogans. A bookshop recommends that you "read while they raid." A shampoo manufacturer advises women not to "blackout the highlights in your hair." A patent medicine claims it is a "doctor's barrage against ill health." A biscuit company boasts that its product is being supplied "in specially sealed tins, both airtight and gasproof." A jeweler offers "non-rusting plainly and permanently engraved identity discs, which can be worn near the body." A dress shop lures trade with "a fashion for night air raid warning . . . zip-fastened, one-piece suit . . . expanding pocket will hold a torch and compact, first aid case . . . gas mask contained is waterproof."

Other advertisements offer curtain fabrics gaily colored on the inside and black on the outside to help "shut your door on Old Devil blackout;" lotions for keeping the hands soft while digging trenches; eye drops to ease blackout eye strain and portable heaters to warm air raid shelters. British business men are offering back-yard shelters on the installment plan.

War has also brought unexpected prosperity to tattoo artists and given jobs to Cubist, Surrealist, modernists, futurist and naturalist painters who once cluttered Montparnasse terraces. Tattoo experts report a flourishing trade in skin decorations—regimental badges, flags, and given names of wives and sweethearts.

Most of the Parisian artists are now serving their country as camou-

(Continued on page 58)

Our Billion Dollar Rock

Oahu, key of the Hawaiian Islands, has become Uncle Sam's strategic fort in the Pacific Ocean

LON JACKSON

A GROUP of volcanic rocks, named after the ancient Polynesian navigator, Hawaii, is the scene today of the most concentrated United States army, navy and air activity since the World War.

Tossed into the lap of the United States before the turn of the century after a Gilbert and Sullivan opera revolution, Hawaii soon stood in the American mind for three things: sugar, pineapples and the hula. Today above all else it stands for national defense. A billion dollars have been poured into Oahu, the mid-Pacific rock on which Honolulu is located, to make it the most strongly fortified spot in the world. The year 1940 will add another hundred million to that total.

A $25,000,000 airport is under construction, and a $10,000,000 drydock. Dredging has begun for a $5,800,000 seaplane base across the island from powerful Pearl Harbor. Three millions more are being poured into surrounding island seabases. The food bill alone for the army and navy forces on Oahu comes to $20,000 a day.

On Oahu's 604 square miles of rock are the United States' strongest airplane defense base, the greatest concentration of American troops, the most powerful naval harbor of all time, the largest fleet scouting force, more anti-aircraft equipment than there is in the forty-eight states of the union.

In the vast reaches of the Pacific, unbroken for 2,200 miles by any consequential land masses, Oahu bobs up almost perfectly located as the apex of a giant defense triangle of which Dutch Harbor, Alaska, and Panama are the other two tips. Of these three places, Oahu, base of this year's naval maneuvers, is the most strongly fortified.

Let us try to imagine what this mighty defense base would look like and act like if it were called on to repel an attack. Imagine five bomb-laden planes darting out of low-hanging clouds and powerdiving on Fort Armstrong, in downtown Honolulu. They are meant to distract attention from another group, 20,000 feet up, streaking in from the sea. This is the real "enemy." Their goal is Oahu's defense backbone.

Arriving in a V of v's, thirty-five planes split formation. Three v's veer toward Pearl Harbor, focal point of attack. Another shifts for Lualualei, the navy's new ammunition dump. A fifth aims at the Pearl Harbor oil tanks and a sixth for Hickam Field near Pearl Harbor. The last formation spearheads for Aliamanu crater which holds enough ammunition to blow Oahu to Kingdom Come —$20,000,000 worth. These strategic points are within a ten-mile radius.

ALTHOUGH this was to have been a "surprise" attack, listeners and sound amplifiers in mountain recesses have heralded the enemy. The word is hurried from observation posts. Curtiss pursuit hawks whip into the air by two's and three's and climb more than 2,000 feet per minute to meet the invader. Meanwhile, *anti-aircraft guns from a dozen emplacements* have found the range and are knocking the enemy planes out of the sky.

If it were night, powerful Pearl Harbor with its drydocks, ammunition dumps, submarine escape tower, air base, machine shops, barracks would be blacked out. Then suddenly 800,000,000 candle-power searchlights would stab the night, reaching a ceiling of 36,000 feet, nervously slicing the sky. Within a minute, the night raiders would be spotlighted, and within a few seconds more the three-inchers would be barking at them.

Promptly, our battleships would wheel into action against the enemy. Subs, including the Navy's largest, capable of a 15,000 mile cruise, would work out to harass the enemy's plane carrier, from which the bombers were launched, as well as its convoy of destroyers and cruisers.

Army trucks would roll over Oahu's highways and secret army roads and trails, hurrying thousands of soldiers from Schofield barracks to repel invasion with machine guns. At Schofield, too, are armored trucks and heavy tractor-drawn artillery. The really big fellows would be hauled into action on a specially built railway. Whatever the strength of the invading enemy, he would soon know he had been in a battle. For Oahu is ready.

Gunnery and torpedo practice, the rumble of 50-mile-an-hour army tanks, the staccato of machine guns, the thunder of 16-inch coast defense rifles, the roar of 850 H.P. Cyclone motors, the whine of 155 mm. shells, have become commonplace there since last September, when war broke out in Europe.

In writing, the increased activity seems furious. Actually, Hawaii's population (ratio: four Japanese to one resident Caucasian) is little aware of it. The drone of airplane motors is but casually noted. Japanese language schools, enrolment 40,855, keep going. Sugar factors complain that the A.A.A. sugar quota is killing the islands' $65,000,000 annual sugar export business. Gasoline remains at 21½ cents a gallon although tankered 2,500 miles from

San Pedro. Eggs, large, sell at 58 cents a dozen and sugar at 7 cents a pound.

But profound changes have come over Oahu since the fateful summer of 1939. Before that time, the army quietly assumed control of the W.P.A. Unannounced, the Federal Bureau of Investigation opened offices in Honolulu with Robert Shivers, a veteran of twenty years' service, in charge. J. Edgar Hoover's secret operatives in Hawaii are concerned with espionage, sabotage, and infringement of neutrality.

When Adolf Hitler sent his ultimatum to Poland, Hawaii's Pearl Harbor, strongest fortification in Christendom and at the time least protected from foreign agents, was shut by presidential proclamation. No longer could amateur photographers snap unusual camera shots with telescopic lenses. Anyone approaching the harbor had to show a permit signed by Admiral Orin G. Murfin, 14th naval district commandant. The owner of any vessel entering the restricted waters with an alien aboard was subject to a $5,000 fine, five years in prison, or both.

At Kaneohe, across Oahu from Pearl Harbor, work was begun on a $5,800,000 naval air base. The navy got the land from Alice H. Castle, Yoshida Monzo, Ksaki Kimura, Onishi Jimpachi, Sonachi Kawamoto, Tisho Higa, *et al.*

In Washington, the Navy Department let it be known that the greater portion of the United States' scouting fleet would be sent to Hawaii for an indefinite stay. Backbone of the scouting force is the navy's newest aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, commissioned 1938. She carries at least 110 planes and a full complement of 2,072 men.

With the *Enterprise* went six heavy cruisers, one light cruiser and seventeen destroyers. All this reemphasized one thing: America's chief outpost for defense in the Pacific is not the great San Diego base nor any other continental establishment, but the island of Oahu. At present 15 per cent of the U. S. naval forces are on Oahu. It has been intimated on high authority that this latest detachment will remain in Hawaiian waters as a "safety patrol" for the duration of the European war. This fleet will project the scouting arm of the Hawaiian military establishment two thousand miles.

The transfer brought Vice Admiral Adolphus Andrews to Hawaii. He will be in command of one of the opposing fleets when the United States navy concentrates her might here for the 1940 naval maneuvers. Besides the Vice Admiral there are now six rear admirals on Oahu. On May 1, Commander of the Fleet Admiral Claude C. Bloch will assume control of Pearl Harbor—which gives some indication of the importance of Pearl Harbor.

The defeat of Poland was an accomplished fact, when Major General Henry H. Arnold, chief of the army air corps, made a trip to Hawaii for an intensive investigation of the Hawaiian flying force. If smiles and a good golf score mean anything, the ruddy general was pleased with what he saw. In passing, he announced that the Hickam Field personnel of 3,000 officers and men would be doubled. He added that at least 200 planes—including 112 pursuit ships, 60-65 bombers, 14 observation planes, five auxiliary amphibians and three transports—would be sent to Hickam. Fifty of the Curtiss pursuit ships—clocked at more than 500 miles an hour in power dives—have arrived already.

Hawaii's air force, naturally, is kept under wraps. Never do all its planes roar overhead in one tremendous flight. Perhaps 50 may join in an "aloha" review for Armistice day or for visiting congressmen, but certainly not 350 or more.

Oahu stands "on guard" day and night. Daily reconnaissance flights are made around the island, though most Honolulans are unaware of this. Navy patrol bombers fly where the eye can't follow them.

From Tantalus heights, 1,500 feet above the city, you might discern the dim outline of the subs as they slip out of Pearl Harbor, their anchorage. "If we were at war today we could not be more active," a submarine commander told this writer. Other subs are on the "alert" 2,000 miles from Pearl Harbor.

Near Schofield Barracks, centrally located on Oahu, a group of Hawaiian hunters yearning for luau'd pig, nearly met disaster when they followed a wild boar into an area where the army was placing explosive gas bombs.

Plans are already completed for taking over many of the industrial plants of the island on Mobilization Day. During recent army maneuvers cans which did not look unlike pineapple juice cans made by the American Can Co., here, were used for gas containers.

Important to remember too is that Oahu is the base of a new Pacific defense and offense plan. Actual construction of submarine bases has begun in the Pacific to the south and to the west of Oahu at Midway, Johnston, Palymra and Wake. At Johnston, idyllic isle where there are no mosquitoes, a million dollar base is under construction. Three years ago many official charts still marked Johnston as "existence doubtful." The Midway base will be ready as a working base for the coming naval maneuvers.

Major General Charles D. Herron, vigorous, direct-spoken sixty-two year old veteran seasoned by an ample share of front line fighting, announced at the first of the year that the army under his command would be boosted from 22,000 to 25,000 within a few months. This means that more than 10 per cent of the standing army of the United States will be on Oahu.

And the marines are coming. Although they first landed 126 years ago, they have not been made a hard-

hitting organization here until this year. Their force of 550 officers and men will be more than doubled when a full battalion, now being recruited at San Diego fleet marine base, arrives.

Recently the army and the air force combined in a brand new defense scheme. Troops were transported by air. Eleven B-18 bombers carried 110 machine gunners and a crew of 33 men to the island of Kauai, about 90 miles away, in less than half an hour. If all of Hawaii's planes were used for ferrying, 2,000 soldiers could be transported in one flight. A dozen flights could transport 24,000 troops. And if more planes are needed in Hawaii, Hickam Field is but an overnight hop from San Diego. Already scores of 22-ton bombers have demonstrated the feasibility of this trip.

THE most readily observed military activity on Oahu is the army's, with its forty reservations and seven forts bristling with coast rifles which can outslug any enemy warship. The 16-inchers hurl a shell almost two tons in weight a distance of thirty miles.

The nerve center of army activity is at G2, intelligence quarters. If this were a real war the intelligence and general staff would be in the safest dugout obtainable. They have underground quarters hewn out of solid rock. The location does not have a house number. It is bombproof, gas proof and stocked with a good larder.

Now let us consider the less pleasant side of this Hawaiian defense picture. Is the feverish activity of the past several months an indication of weakness, of inadequacies in home defense?

The fact that most of the added strength is being concentrated at Pearl Harbor tells some of the story. Because Pearl Harbor is almost directly against the open sea, enemy planes if unannounced, might be on top of it before the defense could get into action. Well-placed bombs might bottle up the narrow channel. The fact that swift Curtiss pursuiters, faster than any enemy-made planes, are being brought to Hawaii in large numbers establishes quite clearly that this is a weakness and that this weakness is being met. The German submarine and airplane attack at Scapa Flow and the British bombings of Wilhelmshaven have given fair warning.

The last minute excavation of five million cubic yards of coral from the channel to Pearl Harbor, and the building of a drydock large enough to accommodate the world's largest disabled warships, add more brush strokes to the picture.

Upon Oahu itself, one finds weaknesses even greater and perhaps more difficult to surmount. One is the food problem. Fifteen per cent of Hawaii's food is grown here: 85 per cent is imported. In wartime, with troops quartered here, the amount of imported food increases and the present supply of home-grown food could be whittled down by the enemy if undefended Hawaii, the Big Island, were captured. On it is Parker ranch, the second largest stock ranch in the United States, owned by the night-club singer, Richard Smart. Most of the "island beef" comes from there.

Bread-fruit, bananas, olives, dates and of late even Jonathan apples and Scuppernong grapes have been planted on the slopes of snow-peaked Mauna Kea, 13,825 feet high. Future Farmers of America clubs are doing their level best. And plans for growing ninety-day crops, if worse comes to worse, have been mapped out within Oahu's areas. Seed is already here.

The second problem "behind the trenches" is the mixed population. There are only 67,718 *haoles*, bona fide whites, out of a 411,000 population, and in this 67,000—as of 1938—service men are reckoned. As compared to this total, there are 155,042 Japanese. The balance of the population is pot luck—Chinese, Korean, Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian, Spanish, Portuguese, Puerto Rican and Filipino.

The 155,000 Japanese worry the army. Of them, 35,681 are aliens. Some of the others, so-called "hyphenated Americans," hold dual citizenship and are loyal to Japan as well as to the United States.

Some local people vow that the majority of the younger generation Japanese would be loyal to the United States in the event of war with Japan. But army men say that the German population in Poland and Czecho-Slovakia may have caused the collapse of these countries.

What will become of these Japanese in the event of war against an enemy to which Japan is a party? There are numbers of reserve officers in the islands, principally *haoles*. There are hundreds of spools of barbed wire in army warehouses. Ranking army officers have said that in event of war in which Japan is an enemy there will be a large concentration camp and that most of the alien Japanese and troublesome Japanese-Americans will be on the inside looking out. There has been strong talk of dumping them on barren windswept Kahoolawe, separated from the nearest inhabited island by a swift and shark-infested channel.

That Pearl Harbor, Singapore, Gibraltar or the Dardanelles is impregnable is tosh. No naval base in the world is impregnable if the enemy has enough troops, enough planes and enough battleships to take the position. A good defense then is to make the price of taking exorbitant. The United States is doing just that.

At present two walls stand at the Western front in Europe. Each side realizes the cost of taking the opposing defenses. For six months now neither side has dared risk the cost. And certainly, by that same token, Hawaii's wall of defense should give pause to any enemy.

A Londoner Looks at Hollywood

England's famous stage and screen star reflects on his experiences in America's cinema capital

GEORGE ARLISS

ONLY two world-staggering events ever happen in California: one is an earthquake and the other is the arrival of a new picture star in Hollywood. The effect on the population of the arrival of the star is generally greatly exaggerated in the press, while that of the earthquake is discreetly diminished. As a matter of fact, neither event has any lasting effect on the community. Of the two, the interest in the star may last a little longer, but not much.

Hollywood is one of the few places in the world in which a popular picture actor can stroll about in comfort. The natives soon become used to mixing with these live animals which the rest of the world sees only in pictures. Although the familiarity by no means breeds contempt, it relieves the star of the distress of being followed about and examined as though he were a museum piece—his admirers so close at his heels that they might be trying to read the label.

The people who are shopping or strolling on Hollywood Boulevard are mostly men and women connected with the studios. The star is left unmolested, except that sometimes they will come up to me and ask if there is likely to be anything for them in my next picture (they have different methods of approach — timid — respectful — earnest — hopeful); and then there is the man who insists he is an old friend, and that I know him intimately. Having come face-to-face with me he is surprised that I do not take him in my arms. He says with great warmth: "You remember me—Franklin P. Wilson—you remember!" There have been hundreds of extra-gentlemen in my pictures; this might have been one. I might even have spoken to him at some time. So I take the easiest course and say vaguely, "Oh—yes—how are you?"

"Fine!" and shakes me lovingly by the hand. "Well, I stopped you because I thought you'd like to know. You remember Alfred Langdale—an

George Arliss

Englishman—you must remember him—been over here for years. You remember, Alf Langdale."

Again I take the easiest way, "Oh—yes—I think I remember the name."

"Well, he died the day before yesterday. I thought you'd like to know. Well, you're going to do a picture, I suppose—any little character bit, you know. I'm just as good as ever—you remember me—the old reliable—used to be known as one-take Wilson. . . ." until I break away. . . .

My experience of the world is limited but I don't think there can be any such pleasant hotel accommodation anywhere as in Hollywood and Los Angeles. You can go to any one of a number of first-class hotels, with their magnificent dining rooms, and drawing rooms, and ballroom, and you can book a bedroom or a suite just as in any other big city. But in this same hotel you can take what is called a "housekeeping apartment" which, in addition to the usual bedroom and bathroom accommodation, has a sitting-room, a small dining room and a kitchen—a kitchen which has everything in it that any woman could ask for, and half a dozen things that the average British housewife has always wanted without having any idea that they exist. Although there would naturally be extra profit to the hotel if you ordered things from the dining room, every incentive is given you to remain entirely independent of the public service. How far you take advantage of these opportunities is for you to decide, but it gives one a pleasant feeling of seclusion and security.

There is one other method of hotel service of which I have had no experience except in California, and that is the private bungalow. In the grounds of the hotel there are many bungalows consisting of the same accommodation as the housekeeping apartment I have described (or more extensive if needed). You can have your own service or everything can be served from the hotel. There is a certain charm about being in your own detached cottage, with your grapefruit growing outside your front door—and yet with the advantage of being able to get anything you want by pressing a button. It is possible that this method of hotel-keeping exists in other parts of the world, but I have not met it. . . .

EVERYBODY in Hollywood has a car waiting—day and night, it seems to me. You can't live in Hollywood without a car: the standard of distances there cannot be gauged by the mileage in other cities; the roads are wide and straight and comparatively unobstructed. You don't "settle yourself" for a five-or-ten-mile drive when you go to have a cup of tea with a friend; you just jump in and jump out. . . .

My first impression of Hollywood was space—always room for expansion; an enormous village stretching for miles and miles with no building more than two stories high. This is not actually a fact; there are some

high hotels and towering stores, but they are few and far between and the general effect is long ranges of low buildings—photographic shops, teashops, antiques, "Art" (of all kinds), dry goods stores, restaurants, English pipes and tobacco, stationery, hot dogs, drugstores (at every corner). Nearly every one of these places is a personal venture. I mean it is run by a man or a woman who is making an earnest effort to get a living by it. And everything looks temporary. All the shops seem to be saying "Wait and see! Wait till we rebuild, we'll show you something!" But Hollywood goes on—it can't wait to rebuild. Another real estate company puts up another quarter of a mile of shops, which are at once occupied by more antiques, transformed into more beauty parlors—more stationery—more drugstores—and on again for miles and miles. But not a factory or a railway within sight or hearing.

As far as I know, nothing is ever made here except moving pictures. Everything has been brought in from some other part of the United States, even the trees. A mighty desert that once defied man and the elements is tamed to do tricks and lie side by side with the hot dog.... At night, if you drive in the mountains which form a silent and magnificent frame to this strange Hollywood, you see beneath you an immense carpet of sparkling lights; impossible to believe that that is a village—all those miles and miles of lights: twenty—twenty-five—miles; no village was ever so vast; it must be some great fairyland with every fairy bearing a starry wand. It is disturbed only at times by a powerful shaft of light which tells you there be mortals there and that a Grand Opening may be seen tonight.

If you are a lover of the desert, if the desert fascinates you, then you must regard this making of Hollywood as sacrilege. Personally, I find the desert dull. I have driven through hundreds of miles of nothing but sand and brushwood with no sign of habitation, except an occasional wooden shack erected to supply an ice-cream soda, without which no traveler in the American desert could exist—even the camels, if they traversed this country today, would I am sure stop and buy one.

I have spoken of the Hollywood shopping sections as having a temporary aspect. But the residential parts are quite different. The houses are for the most part attractive and picturesque. Every house has a character of its own. There are no "rows of houses"—every structure is different from the one next door. There may be some instances of a builder having put up two or three houses alike but, if so, I have never noticed them.

The gardens are mostly large and perfectly kept. One hardly ever sees a neglected garden. You pay a gardener so much a week or month and he is responsible for your garden. But he is not exclusively *your* gardener; he undertakes the same responsibility for a number of other residents. These gardeners all seem to be Japanese. How many gardens one man takes care of I don't know, but he works diligently and silently all day with the most satisfactory results. The act of watering is made simple. He turns on a tap and behold all over your lawn, at intervals of about six feet, there sprays up a jet of water. (I know that if I adopted the same method at my cottage in Kent, the bills from the water supply company would put me into bankruptcy.)

Apart from the magnificence of the embracing mountains, the beauty of Hollywood is due entirely to the hand of man. For once man has not brought destruction, but grace and charm where there was nothing but waste. You must stand amazed at the tremendous labor and determined effort that have made Hollywood what it is today; at the fine broad motor roads running clear through to the sea—not with chalk-lines to regulate the traffic but often with broad ribbons of green, and with flowers running down the center, which gives one a joyous holiday feeling as one drives along; and you must be amazed at the unbelievable amount of work that has been expended in grading the mountains, making it possible for us to enjoy the exhilaration of driving higher and higher into the rarefied air, without the unpleasant anticipation of meeting death at every turn (a peculiar fascination of mountaineering which never appealed to me). And everywhere an abundance of water.

I don't want to sell Hollywood to you; I own no property there; but I wish you to know that it is not just a large barren place where people do nothing but hold conferences in studios and mutilate the English language.

Of course everything is done on a scale of great magnificence. I have seldom known an instance in the making of my pictures in which the management has not been willing to go to any reasonable expense to gain an effect. Having grown up in the theater where we depend almost entirely on canvas and paint for our illusions, I never cease to be impressed by the unlimited resources of the studios. Houses are built that are almost good enough to live in—churches that inspire you to think seriously of other people's sins—castles that conjure up magnificent ancestors to whom you have no claim—it should be easy to act in such surroundings.

I once met Joseph Jefferson, the famous actor who is remembered in two Continents for his performance of Rip Van Winkle. I asked him if he thought that acting was better in his day than in mine. He thought for a moment and then said that in his day it perhaps required more imagination, because, he said, when he was young you had to feel like a King as you sat on a soapbox covered with red cloth, while today you were sitting on a real throne, or something very like it. I often thought of this when I was playing the Rajah for the screen, and being carried in my palanquin through real rocky California country, surrounded by real natives, with real sunshine and a real blue sky. . . .

In the studio you may not learn how to act or how to make up, or to cook, or to be a good wife and mother, but you inevitably learn Patience. If you are an extra, you come to work at 7:30 A.M. and make your first appearance on the screen at 7:30 P.M.—perhaps. If you are a bit-actor you are elaborately made-up soon after sunrise and you sit about until, having earned a night's repose by attempting nothing, and doing nothing, you take off your make-up and go home and come back again at sunrise the next day. If you are the star you are dressed at 9:30 A.M. as usual; but if the director is not ready for you, you are allowed to stay in your dressing room until you are called. So for a couple of hours you smoke, and try to read the newspaper, and try to write some letters which you would give anything to get off your mind—but you can't; you can't do anything useful, because

your mind is on the big scene that is before you.

Finally you are called and you go on the set and everything is ready for you; the lighting effects have all been rehearsed with your stand-in. You run through for lines and lights. And then comes your further test of patience; the cameraman didn't know that you were going to look up in that scene; so "If you don't mind doing that again, Mr. Arliss—that—where you look up," and then there are directions and corrections, and directions again to invisible men in the upper ether to kill Number Five, and to bring up Number Eight, and to kill the baby—all because I looked up.

At last I say, "Never mind, I won't look up; it doesn't much matter." But by this time the cameraman has got thoroughly interested in this unexpected diversion, and nothing can stop him. So after he has said, "Do you mind just looking up again?" at intervals during the next twenty minutes, and I have been all ready to go, half a dozen times, all is really ready.

Once more I am all keyed-up; the director is all ready to say "Shoot." I square my shoulders, tighten all my muscles, become perfectly unnatural, because I have been natural so often during the past twenty minutes that I can't be natural naturally any more—when the script girl with an eagle eye swoops down upon me and pecks a piece of cotton off my sleeve and swoops back again. I sigh, and tighten up again, more unnaturally than ever, when the director (if it is Adolfi) dashes forward with surprising alacrity and pulls my coat upward from behind, so that it shall cling closely and immaculately to my collar. (Adolfi always lacked confidence in my English tailors.)

I say: If you are a movie actor you have learned patience. You do not throw your eyes and your arms towards the heavens; you do not say "Go away all of you! How can I be expected to have imagination? How can I play my great scene with you all hopping about me? Leave me alone! I am an artist!" No, you do not say that; you have patience; the director says "Shoot," and you play your scene. You are a movie actor . . . .

The making of pictures after a great many years in the theater is to me a holiday. I cannot imagine anything much pleasanter than what is called "location" work—that is, scenes that are shot in the open country. To be out all day in the pure air and sunshine of California, and to be paid for it, is an aspect of work which seems too good to be true . . . .

As a place of residence Hollywood can be the cheapest or the most expensive of any city in the United States. The best hotels are perhaps a little dearer than the same class in other towns, and of course you can build and live just as extravagantly as you could elsewhere. On the other hand if you want to live cheaply you can get more for your money in Hollywood than in any town I know in America. You can get a pleasant apartment with all modern conveniences at a very low rent. Life is comparatively easy in an equable, reliable climate where there is no snow, no severe frost and a great deal of sunshine. If you can once get your relatives to raise the money to send you out there, and give you a little for furniture, then you can live in comparative comfort on a very small income. Of course it costs your family a lot of money for your fare, but on the other hand it is such a long way from home that you will probably never be able to come back again; and you'll have hot and cold water all the time and perhaps even a refrigerator; so it's really nice for everybody. . . .

There is an interesting volume of short stories to be written about almost any half-dozen extras, telling what led to their landing in Hollywood. When I am watching my director handling the confusion and perplexities of a great drawing-room scene, or a royal reception or some such tremendous affair, and an impressive but apologetic extra gentleman edges up to me, and draws my attention to the fact that the director is instructing a military super on some technical point; when the impressive extra gentleman whispers in my ear, "No captain of the Guards would ever do that, sir," I know that I am in the presence of a retired British officer. And if an elderly lady ventures, in a low voice, "No lady of the Court would ever dare to do that in the presence of Her Majesty," I am not very much surprised to find that she was at one time something-or-other in Buckingham Palace; and when a tall and solicitous extra says, "Excuse me, sir, but reely somebody ought to tell the director that no well-trained servant . . ." I am bound to be a little impressed to find that I am getting expert advice from one who was once a valet to a noble English lord. The advice of these well-meaning people cannot be accepted without verification, because it is frequently incorrect. It is generally believed that these matters of etiquette are left to the discretion of the director, but as a matter of fact in the making of important pictures, technical advisers are carefully chosen to watch every scene that is likely to need special knowledge. When I was making "Richelieu" I was so impressed with my priestly advisers that I became terribly good and truthful; when I went up in my lines, instead of attributing the cause to the furniture or my costume, or the carpet, or somebody looking at me strangely from behind the camera, I was in danger of confessing that it was my fault, that I had really forgotten my words—an admission that no self-respecting and dignified star should be reduced to. . . .

Many directors are careful to explain to actors whose experience has been gained entirely in the theater that the technique of screen-acting is entirely different from that of the stage; that it is a different medium and a thing apart. If this is so I have failed to realize it. The only difference I have ever made is to subdue in some cases the climaxes of what we call our "big scenes."

But this is merely an accentuation of the difference we make in the rendering of scenes in large and small theaters. One of the things an actor has to learn is how to reach his audience. His technique is always the same, but his method of expression may be broadened for a large theater in order to conform to the physical

(Continued on page 60)

What's YOUR Opinion?

A monthly department conducted by George V. Denny, Jr., founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air and President of Town Hall, New York

The Question this month:

WHAT AID FOR FINLAND?

As this is being written, the Red army of Soviet Russia is slamming headlong into Finland. By the time this is read, the weakening Finnish resistance may have crumbled. Or the Finns, who have performed so many military miracles during the past several weeks, may have performed another, stiffened their lines, and thrown the invaders back.

Meanwhile, preposterously outnumbered, the Finns appeal to the world for help—and in this country the appeal does not fall on deaf ears. The President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, condemns the Russian invasion, declaring that "American sympathy is 98 per cent with the Finns." Our only living former President, Herbert Hoover, is so sympathetic to the Finnish cause that he is serving as national chairman of the Finnish Relief Fund, Inc. Our Congress has shown its strong sentiment in favor of issuing additional credits to Finland.

More important still is the pro-Finnish sentiment of the American people, since under our form of government there is nothing more important than public opinion in the shaping of national policies.

But just how far does this pro-Finnish sentiment on the part of the American people extend? Is it deep enough to impel them to positive action—for the Finns or against the Russians? How are the minds of the American people working on this question? By what processes of reasoning are they arriving at their conclusions, and what, exactly, *are* these conclusions?

CURRENT HISTORY felt that it might be possible to obtain answers —or approximate answers—to these questions by querying a representative group of citizens, living in a representative state, upon them. It therefore chose at random from its own list of readers in the state of Ohio the names of a number of individuals, of whom it asked the following questions:

"Do you believe that the United States should:

"1. Extend no further help of any kind to Finland in her present undeclared war with Soviet Russia?

"2. Come to Finland's financial assistance by making her a sizeable loan?

"3. Come to her financial assistance by making her an outright gift of a considerable amount?

"4. Supply her, on credit, with non-military materials produced in the United States?

"5. Supply her, on credit, with military materials produced in the United States?

"6. Break off diplomatic and commercial relations with Soviet Russia?

"7. Intervene with arms on Finland's behalf—in other words, declare war on Russia to save Finland from invasion?"

Not all the replies received can be printed in the limited space available. But those which are chosen for publication are typical; the others, to a large extent, duplicate them. The letters and parts of letters appearing below are offered with the thought that they represent a cross-section of American opinion on this question—but not, of course, with the thought that they represent that cross-section with scientific accuracy.

In the first place, a few, though only a few, readers declare that the United States, in their opinion, should extend no further help of any kind to Finland. Typical letters in this category are those from:

Mrs. Howard E. Wurlitzer, business woman, of Cincinnati, Ohio: "I do not think our country ought to give any country aid in any way whatever; it is time we thought of ourselves. The United States should stay away from others' quarrels. If we let sentimentality direct our foreign policies we shall be drawn into the mess very quickly. We might learn from England's cool and ruthless method of taking care of herself first and always."

And Alfred H. Billstein, of Toledo, Ohio: "If we are going to police the political morals of the world we will be at constant war with the have-not nations everywhere. As a keen Englishman said to me: 'If your sympathy-for-the-underdog complex had been developed in 1900 you would surely have fought us in the Boer war.'

"Before I damn Russia completely, I want to see the terms which they

---

EACH week (Thursdays), over N.B.C.'s Blue Network, you hear Mr. Denny and celebrated national figures on America's Town Meeting of the Air, the country's most popular radio forum. In this department in CURRENT HISTORY, Mr. Denny assembles a cross-section of opinion on controversial questions by outstanding authorities, as well as special sections of opinion by readers.

We will be glad to have our readers send in their opinions now on this month's question, "What Aid Should Be Given Finland?" Letters should not exceed three hundred words and should be mailed before March 12. They should be addressed to:

George V. Denny, Jr.
CURRENT HISTORY
420 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y.

offered Finland in their negotiations. In appraising them I shall ask, 'What would the United States have done if a foreign and semi-hostile power controlled one side of Chesapeake Bay all the way from Annapolis to Norfolk?'

"Would we have remained indifferent if we faced the possibility of having this nearby country used as a hostile air base by countries within easy flying distance?

"Very probably not, in view of the fact that over 75 per cent of our own wars have been aggressive.

"The best service we can render Finland is not to encourage her into a complete sacrifice at 50 to 1 odds, but do what we can to bring an early peace to save the country from annihilation.

"Only thoughtless fanaticism will lead to a break with Russia. Her war and peace record is infinitely better than Japan's, and we may need her badly if we continue to drift toward conflict with Japan.

"I'm bitterly disappointed with Russia's aggression, *but* I'm suspending judgment."

It is no surprise to learn from our readers' letters that there is little or no sentiment for American intervention with arms on Finland's behalf. To judge from these letters, Americans seem to be almost unanimous in the belief that the United States should keep out of war.

"Almost" unanimous, but not quite. Kermit P. Lewis of West Farmington, a teacher in an average rural high school, submitted the questions which CURRENT HISTORY asked him to his classes in American history and commercial geography. Six pupils, all boys, expressed the opinion that the United States *should* "Intervene with arms on Finland's behalf—in other words, declare war on Russia to save Finland from invasion."

Writes Mr. Lewis: "I was rather surprised at the number of these votes, and I asked the six boys whether they would be willing to join the army or navy to fight against Russia. They all said yes. There was no bravado and they seemed very sincere—this in spite of all my previous pacifist endeavors. If this is anything like a fair sampling of the opinions of American youth in general, I am afraid a war spirit of rather large proportions has gained headway."

Mr. Lewis himself feels — and twenty-five members of his classes feel the same way—that we should supply Finland on credit with military materials produced in the United States. But he adds, "They should not be transported by American seamen on American ships."

There is apparently some sentiment in Ohio—but very little—which holds that the United States should

George V. Denny, Jr.

break off diplomatic and commercial relations with Soviet Russia. On the pro side of this question, for example, is Mr. Daniel G. Jencks of Lima, who takes the stand "for the reason that Russia has not lived up to her promises made to us" when we extended recognition to her.

Finland, Mr. Jencks comments further, expressing a thought that is in many American minds at this moment, "is the only World War borrower who has been faithful to her obligations. I feel that she will continue to do so if she can maintain her freedom. Finland is not asking for a gift; a loan is more satisfactory to her and to us. If a loan is provided Finland should be allowed to spend it any way she wants and for whatever she wants."

But for one reader who advocates severance of our relations with Soviet Russia, many take the directly contrary position, although several say we never should have entered into such relations in the first place.

Thus Elgin L. Shaw, aeronautical engineer, of Akron, writes: "I see no more basic cause for breaking diplomatic relations with Russia than with Germany, Italy, or Japan, since each has been a similar type of aggressor." Mr. Shaw adds: "I do not believe that we should sanction any financial or military assistance which would prolong the war or extend its field of operation. To do so would only jeopardize our chances of staying out of the major conflict that would eventually result. It is my opinion that the United States should help Finland by sending her, on credit if need be, only those necessities which tend to alleviate some of the suffering and privation of her people. By extending her aid (without profit) in the necessities for life (not death) we not only have her gratitude but gain the respect of all peoples of the educated world. This we surely need if we are to be instrumental in helping form a lasting peace after the war in Europe is at an end."

The following comment comes from Dr. Wallace Johnson of Middletown, who writes that he is now retired from a country medical practice which included many Finnish families: "If we had not opened relations with Russia, to satisfy political ambitions of the New Dealers, we would not need to break off relations that seem to be doing us neither good nor harm. While the relations remain we can be observers, and probably Russia will do the breaking off and save us the trouble." Dr. Johnson would like to see the United States supply Finland on credit with both military and non-military materials produced in this country, and also make a sizable loan to Finland, for he too says, "If she can repay the loan, her past record shows that she will do so."

Casting her vote with those opposed to the severance of relations with Russia, Mrs. Laura S. Bale, housewife of Cleveland, notes: "If Russia gives our country legal reason to break off diplomatic relations, it is the business of the State Department to take care of the matter in the usual way. In view of the unsettled trade relations all over the globe, and the effect which further instability would have upon our domestic problems and our unemployment, it seems to be wiser not to let our sympathies run away with our good judgment. We are not prepared to fight the battles of every unjustly attacked country."

There is realism—some might call it traditional Yankee shrewdness—in the several letters which point to positive values to us in our present diplomatic relations with Moscow.

Writes F. Lee Kilgore, farmer, of London: "We should not break off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia as we can use our Ambassador as a listening post. My opinion is that the United States should come to Finland's financial assistance by making her an unrestricted loan. She is eligible to this under the present law as she has never defaulted on the payment of her war debts. If Washington does not make this loan, it should supply Finland, on credit, with military materials produced in the United States."

The strong feeling which the Russian invasion of Finland has aroused in many Americans is clearly evident in the letter of the Rev. George W. Knepper, of Akron, Minister of the High Street Church of Christ: "Just now Finland is the champion of liberty, justice and right. As lovers of the finer life and fair play, we Americans should share her battle. I favor the cancellation of her debt to us, the outright gift of a large defense fund, and supplying her with planes and guns—all she can use. I would not declare war on Russia, nor withdraw our representatives. The recognition accorded Russia was one of the grave mistakes of the New Deal, but to withdraw now would not be advisable. No sane man wants war, but those who dodge the issue today only condemn their sons to the slaughter tomorrow."

The letter of E. Perry Hicks, of Wooster, opens with the exclamation: "The United States must keep out of war!" But it soon indicates its author's hope that the United States, nevertheless, will supply considerable assistance to Finland, for it continues: "This country is of greatest value to the world as a neutral, and, when peace finally does come, as mediator. Nevertheless, I see no reason why the United States should not aid Finland by supplying her, on credit, with non-military materials, and perhaps with certain military materials, produced in the United States.

"The crisis of the day is the struggle between Finland and Soviet Russia. If Finland holds out, and is able to stop the 'Red wave' at her borders, much danger of Communism and totalitarian government in the West will be past. But if Finland cannot get supplies and is able to ward off Stalin's 'spring thrust,' practically the only result we could be certain of is that the United States would be less secure from war, and Communism would have a stronger foothold in western Europe.

"Aside from these reasons, Finland has been the only one, of all the debtor countries of the United States, to pay her debts in the past. It would seem that the United States should show, in some way at least, its appreciation. I feel that if the United States turns its back on Finland at the present and merely says, 'I'm sorry,' in the future we will have occasion to hang our heads and admit that we failed democracy in a trying time."

A few of those queried believe that any American loans to Finland should be made as private loans, not as government loans. Writes Uriah H. Myers of Toledo: "We cannot help the poor Finns officially, but as individuals, through the Red Cross, or by using the Scandinavians, or the English for that matter, as intermediaries, we should go the limit. Public sentiment in this part of the country is strong for neutrality, though unanimous for the Allies; the thought being that we can help later with peace terms if our attitude has been 'correct' internationally. The women are all pacifists, for fear their sons and brothers might be drafted. The politicians are afraid of them. They vote pretty generally out here."

As a thought at an interesting tangent, Mr. Myers adds: "I am an old man, ill and poor, and it would be in very poor taste for me to talk of fighting; but if I were an able-bodied young man out of a job, and on relief, as so many are, I would jump over to Canada and sign up, for if the English and French are licked, we will have to go in, maybe when it is too late. This is my personal view, but it is not the prevalent view here."

Ira D. Shaw, of Oberlin, stresses the following points: "Our country has grievously erred, as I believe, in supplying the invading countries, Germany, Japan and Russia—with war materials. We would better honor ourselves and the world if we should refuse them any materials that might be used in warfare except food."

Mr. Shaw continues: "Any expeditionary assistance to any of the Old World nations would be a fatal mistake. But we must be prepared for any emergency that may arise in case the dictators overwhelm Europe and Asia. That means an adequate defensive program for the Americas. Since the rearmament of Germany would have been impossible without the connivance and even over assistance of the leading League of Nations signatories, we owe them nothing in the line of military assistance even to prevent their dissolution.

"I was in the World War, and am fully convinced from what I heard and saw during the parleys in Paris while the League of Nations was being hatched that none of the major nations ever expected the League to function. If it had been a real working document, they never would have signed it. The smaller nations pinned their hopes upon it, but they leaned on a broken staff."

Miss Helen Wright, of Alliance, a teacher of European History, has a many-sided program which she believes this country might well follow in its relations with Finland. She writes:

"Finland deserves our sympathy. It should be expressed through private contributions, or relief agencies, not by government loans or gifts, which might lead to our eventual involvement in the war.

"We should supply Finland with non-military materials, with credit to the extent of her recent debt payments to us, if risks to American shipping and lives are not involved.

"Unless we are willing to go all the way and allow ourselves to become involved in war with Russia, or Germany, or both, in Finland's defense, we should not give Finland any kind of direct military aid.

"If our government would exert the full weight of its influence in an effort to cooperate with other neutrals to bring peace, that would be the best help we can give Finland. To do that we need to maintain diplomatic relations with, and hold the confidence of, all the nations concerned.

"More important than the independence of Finland, much as we would regret to see it lost, is the maintenance of the democratic ideal and the preservation of our civilization in at least one great nation. We can not do our part in the performance of that duty by going to war with any nation."

We will not have to go to war if we act with reasonable wisdom, thinks Harris R. C. Wilson, D. D. S., of Cleveland. He writes: "I would stop all United States commerce that might lead to military aid to Russia. I would not hesitate to suggest to Turkey, Iran, Japan and even Afghanistan that this is a good time to attack Russia and take her Caucasus oil resources. Such attacks would the more rapidly exhaust Stalin's resources and his prestige in Moscow, divert his action from Finland, and embarrass his sending of supplies to Hitler.

"While we make these diplomatic moves, the United States should build the largest navy and air force yet recommended to our Congress. If we build them large enough we would not have to use them in war."

It will be plain from the foregoing letters that these readers of CURRENT HISTORY are well informed on this question of our assistance to Finland, are deeply interested in it, and have given it intelligent thought. That probably is true, not only of these readers, but of the American public in general.

What American Democracy Means to Me

Foreword

This is the essay which won first prize in the Adult Division of Town Hall's Essay Contest on the subject, "What Does American Democracy Mean to Me?" More than seven thousand men and women submitted essays in this Contest, representing every state in the union and several foreign countries.

The winner of the first prize is Mr. G. Aubrey Young, pastor of the Chestnut Level Presbyterian Church near Quarryville, Pennsylvania. He will receive $500 in cash and a free trip to New York to appear on the program of "America's Town Meeting of the Air."

In addition to this first prize, there are also a second prize of $200.00, a third prize of $100.00 and twenty additional $10.00 prizes.

The money for prizes in the Adult Division of this Contest was donated by Mrs. Henry Morgenthau, Sr., of New York City.

THE economic crisis and the seeming inability of either government or business to cope with it, the conflict between those who would have a "planned economy" and those who say "Let us alone," the vastly increased expenditures for relief and armaments, the civil war raging in the ranks of organized labor, the rise of totalitarian states and the outbreak of war abroad—all these developments overshadow the contemporary scene, leaving no room either for complacence or indifference. Obviously it is a time to remember my heritage and to consider what this democracy—the "American Way"—means to me.

To begin with, American Democracy has given me a heritage and background upon which I have been proud to build my life. My ancestors fought in the Revolution and aided in the establishment of representative government. Two of my grandfathers fought in the Civil War, one for the North, the other for the South. But both, in a larger sense, fought for their country, for after the conflict, having lost most of his possessions, my Southern grandfather with a singular lack of rancor and bitterness built for himself a new home in the territory later to become the state of Colorado. Because of him and others like him I have enjoyed the advantages of home and school and church in a free land. Without wealth I have been able to attend college and graduate school and enter my chosen profession. The fruits of the labors of those who established and preserved American Democracy have been mine. Upon this heritage I build my life.

Today, as a clergyman I feel that the aspect of American Democracy which guarantees freedom of opinion and worship means most to me. Figuring very large in my life is the liberty to think my own thoughts and express them without fear of those in political power or of those who may hold opposite views. I have not always agreed with Roosevelt any more than Martin Niemoeller has agreed with Hitler, but I remain a free and independent pastor while he is in solitary confinement in a concentration camp. I still have my home and family; Niemoeller is separated from his and lives in a narrow cell, containing only a table, chair, and bed—"alone amid a death-like silence." Furthermore, since I prize and respect my own freedom of thought and expression, I also believe in the same liberty for others. American Democracy has a place for what Walter Lippmann calls "The Indispensable Opposition." Giving a hearing to the other fellow is not a matter of mere toleration; it is a vital necessity in order to know the truth. My own ideas find mending in the ideas of others.

As meaningful to me, however, as my own liberty is the freedom and place accorded my church. It has grown up with the country, an integral part of it, yet not dominated by the state or depending upon government for its support. It has an equal place with all other denominations and faiths. It is not discriminated against or hindered by any civil power. Its members, whether black or white, rich or poor, have the same freedom of worship and conviction. I am pastor of a church well over 200 years old. Never has its existence been threatened by anything but the indifference of its own members.

These blessings of American Democracy are not mine just to enjoy. Something more is required. "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—to secure and guarantee this great trinity of human rights my government was established, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed—of which I am one. Theoretically at least, power and responsibility rest in the people. That is what the roots of the word "democracy" mean: "people plus power." This has tremendous implications for me. I am only one among millions, but I am *one*. I have a name and a place—only a little name and an inconspicuous place to be sure—but still I am one citizen invested with power and responsibility. This means that the issues confronting the whole of American Democracy also confront me. This means that the heritage of American Democracy, which includes representative government, free enterprise, and liberty of opinion and worship, is mine either to preserve with every care or to lose through neglect.

If American Democracy is precious to me then I cannot be indifferent to the fact that there is too great a concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. I cannot be indifferent to the large proportion of my fellow citizens who are ill-fed, ill-sheltered, ill-clothed, at a time when granaries, lumber-yards, and cotton warehouses are full to overflowing. What shall it profit America to be the richest nation in the world, if its cities have bread-lines, if its farmers are dispossessed, if its workers are unemployed? Furthermore, I cannot be indifferent to alien philosophies whose adherents pay lip service to Democracy while their hearts and loyalties are pledged to totalitarian governments across the sea. I cannot be indifferent to the danger of war and its disastrous effects upon Democracy. All these problems demand rational examination and discussion. By the democratic processes of legislation, administration, and cooperation we must strive to find their solutions. If American Democracy is worth what it cost, then it is worth preserving. The resources of religion, science, arts, and letters are at our disposal and command. Let us then give American Democracy not only our appreciation, but our consecration—our devoted endeavor to bring the "real into closer conformity to the ideal."

The World in Books

(Continued from page 9)

real-estate promoter, speculator, and subdivider, and reputedly California's first millionaire.

Another historical document with a California locale, but of interest to readers everywhere, is the reprinting of McGlashan's *History of the Donner Party*, an account based on original correspondence and interviews with the survivors of this ordeal of a winter snowbound in the high Sierras. An introduction, notes to clarify certain points in the text, and maps to show the route the Donner party followed add to the value of the book. Probably no story has attracted more interest and sympathy than this struggle to the death to get across the forbidding Sierras.

In *The Bolsheviks and the World War*, by Olga Hess Gankin and H. H. Fisher, the Hoover War Library makes available another volume dealing with the war period, the origin of the Third or Communist International. The documents included relate to Lenin's defense of the Bolshevik viewpoint, his attempts to organize the Lefts within the International, and to the efforts of the leaders of the Second International to persuade the Bolsheviks to compromise.

Notes on the Presses

University press books continued to win new honors and distinctions during the last year. The University of Minnesota Press placed two books among the "Fifty Books of 1940" selected by the American Institute of Graphic Arts: *Modern Mexican Art*, by Laurence E. Schmeckebier and *The Geese Fly High* by Florence Page Jaques. The University of Oklahoma Press won a place on CURRENT HISTORY'S list of the ten most notable books of 1939 with C. H. Peterson's *Propaganda for War*, which Burton Rascoe, one of the judges selecting the book, called one of the most important works to be published in this or any year.

Yale University's *The Cruise of the Raider "Wolf"* is one of the current leading non-fiction best sellers and was condensed by *Reader's Digest*.

The Duke University Press Centennial Contest, in which a prize of $1500 was offered for the best scholarly manuscript on the field of social, literary or artistic history of the United States, was won by Clement Eaton for his *Freedom of Thought in the Old South*. Mr. Eaton, a native of North Carolina, is head of the Department of History in Lafayette College. Because of the excellence of the manuscripts, the judges, consisting of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Merle E. Curti, and Norman Foerster, recommended that a second prize be offered; it was won by Herbert Ross Brown of Bowdoin College for his *The Sentimental Novel in America, 1789–1860*.

A new project undertaken by the Columbia University Press is called *The Columbia Studies in American Culture*. The aim of the series is "to bring together scholarly studies of those aspects of American culture that in the past received scant treatment . . . . but which are increasingly being recognized as essential components of social or cultural history. "Five books in the series have already been published, two are being issued this spring, and two are in preparation. The Columbia University Press is also active as publishers for the National Broadcasting Company, issuing literature in connection with many of its "public service projects."

The University of California Press is bringing out Volume II of Kirno's *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent* in May. . . . . This press is also publishing C. F. MacIntyre's translations of fifty bylines by Ranier Maria Rilki, the German poet, a number of whose works have already been published in American periodicals and which have earned wide recognition for their sensitive, sharply-etched quality.

The first volume in the elaborate "Pennsylvania Lives" project of the University of Pennsylvania Press will be published this Spring. The biographies in the series which will be limited to three titles a year, will reflect Pennsylvania's important roles—political, cultural, industrial—of our national life.

THEY SAY

Quotations from the World Press

Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt: Recent Pen Portraits

—Condensed from a column by Harlan Miller in The Washington Post

The President couldn't pass for fifty-five. But neither would he be mistaken for a patriarchal sixty. He looks his age, a well-weathered fifty-eight, with a face more deeply etched by conflict than by time.

Most of his photographs show his face smoother and more impervious than it is. A sad disservice; it spreads the myth that he rides this turbulent time all serene and unscathed. He does not. But also, he is not a futile worrier.

In certain lights Roosevelt's face is as deep-lined as Lincoln's.

Callers see him at three and emerge agog at his vim, the high spirits of a man of thirty. Callers see him at five and swear he is worn and fading.

Last week I talked separately with two men who had seen him that day, men who see him frequently.

"Never saw him looking stronger," said one.

"Never saw him so fatigued," said the other.

Neither is right, of course. Tedium tires him, novelty revives him. A sudden flash of give-and-take makes him soar from the depths of a brown study. Opposition, criticism stoke him up like a supercharger. He warms to flippancy and irreverence.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Under the pitiless diagnosis of thousands of eyes, he is as much at ease as any Barrymore. His aplomb grows smoother.

For a bit of horseplay he doffs his burdens with a shrug. For a moment he is an amiable Harvard alumnus.

And suddenly, with no more transition than a flex of his neck muscles he is the New Deal President again.

An inveterate wisecracker himself, he sympathizes with other wisecrackers. I have never seen him let another's lame wisecrack lie flat on the floor where it falls. He helps pick it up.

When a humorist turns out unexpectedly good he is as incredulously and candidly surprised and pleased as a small boy whose father without warning tells him an entertaining story.

It has passed almost unnoticed that Roosevelt's struggle is first of all within himself, next with his ardent lieutenants. Last and least of all with his adversaries.

To the jeers from the hostile grandstand he reacts exhilaratedly, like a Giant third-baseman to Brooklyn's bleachers.

He has learned a touch of irony is better than a scuffle. He does not meet opposition as head-on as he used to.

His endless struggle is within himself. He is both the conservator of a cherished past, a well-beloved status quo, and the driven explorer of brave but fearful new worlds.

And he fights daily a guerrilla warfare with his intimate advisers. No two of them agree fully with him or with each other.

No two men see the present alike, much less the future.

Roosevelt is sugar-coated transition. Who stands firmer against world revolution?

His enemies on the left and right attest that the Roosevelt Revolution was a myth. Today the more extreme labor leaders are lukewarm to him.

He has entrenched himself so near the center that there's scarcely room for a small reactionary to squeeze in between him and the center.

Revolution from either the left or the right would to Roosevelt seem too much like scuttling the ship, from steerage or first-class. Roosevelt is sugar-coated transition. The right doesn't want transition, the left doesn't want it sugar-coated. No wonder Roosevelt on his fifty-eighth birthday is equally sardonic toward the left and the right. In the last year he has learned to be sardonic, even about a third term.

The First Lady

—Condensed from a column by Bill Goode in The Washington Post

I saw her again today, Joe. There's a little flower shop down on Seventeenth street, not two blocks from the White House. I was trudging down the sidewalk, kicking the slush with my rubbers, when I saw the White House car parked there in front.

Who else could it be? I hate to gawk at public figures, until they've been frozen into statues anyway, but there's something about her . . . I strolled on a few yards and turned and waited.

I remember the first time I saw her.

Eleanor Roosevelt

She came to a students' meeting at the university, just as she's gone to scores of meetings like it all over the country.

You've only seen her in the newsreels, Joe, so you don't know what she looks like. There's something warm and human and intimate and friendly and great . . . They haven't invented the camera yet that can quite catch it. But it's there.

She spoke for about thirty minutes in that precise, hyperenunciated manner, and everybody applauded politely when she was through.

The chairman called for questions.

"Now you'll see, you dope," my next-seat neighbor said. "Watch her wilt."

But she's no weak sister. She stood up there and answered everything that was flung at her, and she did it without hedging. There was none of this flippant, wisecracking epigrammatic evasion that British lecturers, for instance, are particularly adept in using.

I saw, all right, and I heard, and so did my cynical neighbor.

I tell you, Joe, she was terrific. In that pleasant, good-tempered manner, she answered everyone, and there were plenty of queries that were daggered on all sides with malice aforethought.

She's a democrat, Joe, a little-"d" democrat. She doesn't talk about the poor as if they were numbers. She doesn't tell of the poverty-stricken, hopeless, helpless, sick and dirty people she's fought for as exhibits, A, B, C.

And when she meets you there's none of that professional Tammany handshake-and-smile mechanism that nine out of ten Washington bigshots use on their constituency. I'd swear she means it when she says, "I'm glad to meet you."

She actually likes people, Joe, all kinds of people. She doesn't just feel sorry for the jobless women, the sick miners, the homeless 'croppers, the girls at the reform school or the women in the old ladies' homes who're improperly cared for. You have to go way back, Joe, a long, long way back, to find someone who went about ministering to the weak in that spirit.

Maybe I'm a sucker, Joe. Maybe, as some people say, a woman's place is in the home. But the history of this country is going to be different because one woman didn't think so.

So you see, that's why I had to stop and wait.

Pretty soon, there she was, striding across the sidewalk in those long, unfeminine steps. Her chauffeur threw the door open, she paused, nodded and smiled at an old man who tipped his hat, spoke to the chauffeur, and was gone.

I felt better, just seeing her, Joe. I feel the same way sometimes when I drive down to the Lincoln Memorial and look up there and see he's still sitting there.

Maybe, maybe this country's going to be all right after all.

The Farmer's Dollar

—Condensed from The Ohio Farm Bureau News

The consumer's food dollar goes largely for distribution and processing. Only forty cents of that dollar goes to the farmer. Now let us see where the farmer's dollar goes.

Surprising as it may seem—and these figures are based on farm account records supervised by the Rural Economics Department, Ohio State University—food tops the list of the farmer's expenditures. Of each dollar spent by the farmer, fourteen cents goes for store-bought food, thirteen cents for household operation, twelve cents for taxes, eleven and one-half cents for clothing, nine cents for machinery, eight cents for labor, seven cents for buildings and fences, seven cents for automobiles, six cents for feed, four cents for gasoline and oil, three cents for lime and fertilizer, two cents for feeder stock, and four cents for miscellaneous expenses.

Derso and Kelen, N. Y. Herald-Tribune

The New Double-Headed Eagle

Grapes of Joy—"Okies" Forge Ahead

—Condensed from a dispatch from Salinas, California, to The Christian Science Monitor

In 1933 merely a series of tents, shoddy auto trailer camps and packing box shanties, East Salinas—originally dubbed "Little Oklahoma" because of the large number of migrants from the Sooner State settling there—is today a thriving, prosperous-looking community, a land of new opportunity for more than 3,500 of the 300,000 depression and Dust Bowl refugees who have poured into California in recent years.

The story of successful migrants from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Missouri, Nebraska, and other midwestern states who now reside in this unincorporated residential-business district adjoining Salinas, America's lettuce capital, is reassuring.

Most of those who migrated to this district came penniless, transported in typical "jaloppies" and trailers looking for jobs—anything to give them a new start in life.

The first migrants—the influx began in 1933—settled in auto trailer camps on the outskirts of the City These soon became overcrowded. The newcomers then sought cheap land on which to park their trailers or pitch a tent while they sought work. Land prices being too high within the City of Salinas proper, the migrants found cheap land to the east of the city limits.

Two old-time Salinas residents who owned large tracts of unimproved farm land—without water, gas or electricity—decided to subdivide and sell their property to these land-hungry Americans at prices within their means. The average price for a 50 by 120 foot lot was $200, $50 down and four years to pay. But in 1930, when the area was first opened, a few five-acre tracts—originally designed for chicken ranches—were sold and in turn subdivided by others into 50 by 50 lots selling for $50, with as little as $5 down.

Most of the migrants had to borrow to make their down payments. Elton Hebbron, first subdivider of a large area in the district, said that 90 per cent of his credit sales had proved successful.

Trailers served as homes for many who bought land and the first structure usually built on the property was a garage for the family "jalop-

py." Those who had no trailers pitched tents for temporary dwellings. Others, not even having tents, obtained cardboard boxes from Salinas stores and used them as covering for their improvised shacks. Discarded corrugated metal sheeting served as home building material for others.

The migrants—those who were willing, able, and sincerely desirous of getting off relief which many had had to rely on at first—found work in the Salinas area, largely in the growing lettuce industry (valued at $20,000,000 in 1940) or allied industries. Examples of typical successes —proofs of the indomitable American spirit bearing fruit—are numerous.

One Nebraska farmer who had lost all in the depression drove to East Salinas in his "jaloppy" in 1933, obtained a position in one of the high-paying lettuce packing sheds—wage rates being at 65 cents an hour—and was soon able to build a tiny two-room shingle cottage to house his wife and two children. Continuing his work in the lettuce sheds—and doing a good job—he was able after two years to purchase another piece of property and build a four-room addition to his two-room cottage. A few years later he bought a third adjoining piece of property and constructed a substantial five-room home. He now rents his two original homes and owns an entire block of property.

Two unemployed Oklahoma building tradesmen came here penniless in 1933, looking for work. First obtaining odd jobs, they soon had saved enough to build their own homes, then build homes for others. Today it is known they have done more than $100,000 worth of building in East Salinas.

One Tennessee migrant brought his wife and two sons to "Little Oklahoma" in 1934. Like most of the others, he was "broke." Starting out with an inexpensive used truck—he borrowed to make the down payment —he began hauling and selling fertilizer to lettuce and vegetable farmers in the district. Today he owns eight trucks and six houses in East Salinas. His two sons own two trucks each; one son owns three homes, the other two.

Countless other examples could be cited of former midwestern and southern sharecroppers, tenants, obtaining work in lettuce or other agricultural industries in and around Salinas, of former tradesmen, small business men obtaining jobs and soon going into business for themselves here—and making good. There have, of course, been failures here, too.

This much can be concluded, however. In 1933 a dirty, unpainted, gardenless, ugly shanty town of approximately 200 persons, East Salinas has grown in the last seven years to a thriving community.

Canard Enchaîné, Paris

EUROPEAN FREE-FOR-ALL

"And who are you?"
"I am the neutral."

In This Corner: Facts About the Champion

—Condensed from Richards Vidmer's column, "Down in Front," in The New York Herald-Tribune

Even those who have seen Joe Louis rise to the heavyweight championship and defend the title several times hardly know the Brown Bomber. We see him in his training camp, methodically mauling his sparring partners. Sometimes we stop and talk with him and he answers in monosyllables. Seldom do we see him smile, never do we hear him laugh.

Those who must judge solely from his appearance in actual battle probably get the impression that he is silent, even sullen, and wholly devoid of any emotion. He is expressionless from the time that he enters the ring until the referee raises his arm in token of triumph.

But there is another Louis that a few intimates know. One of the few who has seen him frequently off stage, so to speak, is Mushky Jackson, of the Twentieth Century Sporting Club staff. Here are some of the things about Louis perhaps you never knew until Mushky made a note of them:

He likes to play golf and hits a long ball, but doesn't think so much about his score as seeing how far he can hit 'em. He feels that golf gives him a lot of walking and strengthens his legs.

He does a lot of horseback riding and proudly owns a couple of show horses that have won blue ribbons. Riding also combines business with pleasure, for he feels it makes his body supple.

Lately he has taken up bowling and averages around 185. He feels it strengthens his arms.

Every morning in his training camp he gets up at seven o'clock and runs six miles, accompanied by Jack Blackburn, his trainer, and his sparring partners.

He rests until ten o'clock, when he eats his first meal, a hearty breakfast, and he doesn't eat again until dinner at five-thirty.

He is mad about hot music and carries a Victrola and a stack of records with him. When he turns on a tune he dances around the room with a phantom partner, making up trick

steps as he goes along and grinning from ear to ear.

He is an ardent follower of the comic strips, taking the daily output off in a corner and roaring with laughter as he turns the pages. He goes into long and serious speculations as to what is going to happen to Dick Tracy or Joe Palooka. Sometimes he even worries about them.

He follows the sports pages and sometimes discusses different fighters he knows, but prefers to argue about baseball.

He enjoyed making the picture in which he appeared and hopes to make another—a detective story that will be filmed in New York.

With ten title fights in the last three years, he is figuring on four more this year. He will stay in training until September.

There are fifteen men connected with his training camp. Bill Bottoms is his dietician and private chef, who has prepared 1,800 meals for Louis in the course of four and a half years.

Louis plans to have Bill take charge of the food situation at the dude ranch which Louis owns at Utica, Mich., twenty-two miles from Detroit. Louis has dreams of turning this ranch into a country club when he retires and opening it to the public.

Radford Morris, athletic director and coach at Crispus Attucks High School in Indiana, serves as secretary to the managers, Julian Black and John Roxborough, and also as tutor to Louis.

Freddy Guinyard is Louis's personal secretary and travels all over the country with Louis. He also is a camera addict and is constantly taking pictures of Louis in strange attitudes when he isn't looking. Then he develops and prints these pictures and when Joe sees them they provide him with his greatest amusement.

There are six sparring partners in camp and all are friendly with Louis, like him and admire him. He laughs and talks with them between working sessions, but in the ring he shows no recognition and clouts them unmercifully. They each get $15 a day.

When such friends as Bill (*Bojangles*) Robinson or Cab Calloway come to see him he chats merrily along. But when he steps out before strangers who call or into the ring before the fight fans, the black mask comes over his face and never is lifted until he is back among his own people.

For "Pinocchio": Bravo

—Condensed from reviews written by Frank S. Nugent for The New York Times *on the new feature-length cartoon by Walt Disney*

Mr. Disney's "Pinocchio" is the happiest event since the war. His second feature-length cartoon, three years in the making, is a blithe, chucklesome, fresh and beautifully drawn fantasy which is superior to "Snow White" in every respect but one: its score. And, since its score is merry and pleasant, if not quite so contagiously tuneful as the chorals of the seven little men who really weren't there, we shall not have it stressed to "Pinocchio's" disparagement. It still is the best thing Mr. Disney has done and therefore the best cartoon ever made.

Charm is the pulsating, radiant, winning something that shines through this latest Disney creation and makes it so captivating. It isn't at all self-conscious or calculating, like the charm of the matinee idol or honeyed radio voice; it seems almost too spontaneous for us to credit the fact that every bit of it was conceived, weighed, worked out during a three-year gestation period in a cartoon factory. At the risk of being, of all hateful words, sentimental, we would say "Pinocchio" is the work of men of goodwill and good fellowship. From Disney down to his least inker, animator or air-brush wielder, we sense a guild of craftsmen smiling over their drawing boards and paint-pots, delighted with the make-believe world they are creating.

The make-believe here, of course, is basically of Collodi's imagining. It was his notion, in a quaint and moral-pointing fairy tale, to tell of a long-nosed boylike puppet, dubbed Pinocchio by Gepetto, the woodcarver, who was brought to life by the Blue Fairy but told he could not be a real little boy until he had acquired truth, courage and unselfishness. To assist him in his quest, she provided him with a conscience in the form of a cricket—Jiminy Cricket to Mr. Disney's fantastic crew—and there were adventures with a cruel puppetmaster, encounters with a wicked Fox and a Cat, a bewitched sojourn on Pleasure Island, where wayward little boys turned into jackasses, and, finally, an exciting descent to the ocean's floor to rescue poor Gepetto from the belly of a whale. All grist, obviously, to the Disney mill.

And he has had an impish, a scampish, a quizzical and disarmingly whimsical time with it from the moment his Jiminy Cricket (who acts as a debonair tourist guide through this wonderland) opens the pages of his fantasy to that, at the very end, when Figaro, the kitten, jumps into the goldfish bowl to plant an ecstatic and suspiciously fishy kiss on the cupid's-bow lips of Cleo, the kittenish goldfish. For all these curious folk

«Pour aneantir le hitlerisme l'Angleterre se battra jusqu'au dernier Polonais et—si la Pologne est détruite—jusqu'au dernier Francais.»

Winston Churchill dans la séance secrète du cabinet de guerre anglais le 2 septembre 1939

The Baltimore Sun

Reproduced above in its actual size is the first page of a 28 page pamphlet dropped by the Germans over French territory. It reads as follows: "To wipe out Hitlerism England will fight to the last Pole and—if Poland is destroyed—to the last Frenchman." Winston Churchill in a secret session of the English War Cabinet on September 2, 1939.

Haagsche Post, The Hague, Netherlands

Three Germans sat in a restaurant. No. 1 sighed. No. 2 sighed. No. 3 said, "Gentlemen, please let's not talk politics."

"We are one united family."—A. Hitler (formerly Schickelgruber)

Kem in John Bull, London

and all their curious adventures have been drawn with Mr. Disney's invariably quick eye to amusing characterization and humorous detail, with his usual relish for a sly little joke, with his habitual enjoyment of telling incredible whoppers and making them seem just as natural and as utterly unsophisticated as a cricket in spats.

His Jiminy Cricket, as you might have guessed, is the Dopey of "Pinocchio," and for just the opposite reasons. He's smart as a cricket and twice as chirpy. It's something to hear him rap with his cane on the teeth of Monstro the Whale and demand admittance into the Blue Grottoed belly where Gepetto, perched on the rail of a swallowed derelict, is manfully fishing for tuna. No question about it, Jiminy Cricket has a commanding presence and even a sang-froid.

But it isn't easy to call Jiminy the only favorite. Pinocchio is a fresh little cuss, Cleo the Goldfish is a dream and Figaro the kitten is the kind of kitten only Disney's men could draw, exact to the whistling purr, the wicked sideglance, the bewildered and hurt look when the hand that has been casually scratching its neck is suddenly and unceremoniously withdrawn.

"Pinocchio" answers every one of the technical objections raised when "Snow White" was shown. The drawing is finer, with none of the line-straying noticeable when Prince Charming and his Cinderella took the screen. The handling of shadows and highlights is surer, and the color—lovely as it was in Disney's first cartoon feature—is immeasurably lovelier here.

Walt Disney, with his cartoons, has created something that is indubitably art, something that is indubitably entertainment, something that is imperishable and something that will be counted on in our favor—in all our favor—when this generation is being appraised by the generations of the future. For it will be said that no generation which produced and enjoyed a "Snow White" and a "Pinocchio" could have been altogether bad. The record of wars may be against us, and that of depressions and persecution, of malice and suspicion; but in the White Book of the future it will be written that we smiled at a bluebird and grinned at a gnome and chuckled quietly over a kitten called Figaro.

Poll of Opinion

—Condensed from a column by Raymond Clapper, Washington Correspondent of the Scripps-Howard newspapers

For almost a month I have been traveling about the country, talking with all varieties of people. Without attempting to set up competition with the Gallup Poll, I have reached some definite conclusions.

First, I detect no firm demand that President Roosevelt run for a third term. On the contrary, I find among some of his most intelligent supporters grave doubt that he should make the attempt.

Second, I do not believe any wholesale "out-with-the-New-Deal" campaign by the Republicans will be successful. There is questioning about the continuing deficits, a growing feeling that we should soon approach a balanced budget, much criticism of the National Labor Relations Board, but no deep demand for wiping out the majority of New Deal reforms. I am convinced that the most promising Republican position will be that of discriminating opposition and constructive criticism, much along the line followed by Vandenberg.

Third, I find little popular enthusiasm for any of the Presidential personalities in either party. I doubt that there is a real glamour personality in the field. Thomas E. Dewey comes nearest to it, but he suffers because of inexperience.

Fourth, I suspect that the strongest man in either party would be Secretary of State Hull. He appears to me as the man who would make the best candidate for the Democrats and the one the Republicans would have the most trouble defeating.

Hanging over domestic politics is the foreign situation. I do not myself believe that we have finally settled the issue of whether we shall become involved in Europe. Events may reopen it. I sense something of that feeling among the many people I have met.

There is still strong sentiment for keeping out of war. Yet there is a growing consideration of the position we might be in if the British Empire were smashed.

That situation, and its totally unpredictable possibilities, may in the months to come grow into our most acute political issue. The death of Senator Borah has been a blow to isolationist leadership. No one else in Washington speaks with the force which he had.

Southern Pine

—Condensed from The Evening Sun, *Baltimore*

Two weeks ago the first Southern pine newsprint rolled out of a paper machine in Lufkin, Texas. Thus was brought to a successful conclusion an experiment in making newsprint out of the pulp of Southern pines that began some twenty years ago.

The experiment was started by Dr. Charles Holmes Herty, who undertook to convert yellow wood into white paper. By 1938 the experimenters had produced newsprint comparable to that made from the best Canadian spruce, but it remained to produce it on a commercial scale and the depression delayed investment in the news industry. Last January ground was broken for a $6,000,000 paper mill at Lufkin and the mill is now in operation. Next month it expects to turn out 400 miles of newsprint a day, or 50,000 tons a year.

A recent pamphlet of the Department of Agriculture, entitled "Southern Pines Pay," is devoted to the possibilities that lie in the growth of wood crops in the South for their ultimate value in wood pulp, turpentine and timber.

It takes about forty years for a pine tree to mature if it is to make good timber, but before that time the necessary thinning, if properly done, will produce wood pulp, turpentine and firewood. Pines are quick growers. Thus, for example, in central Mississippi a field was planted in pine seedlings in 1926. In 1930 the trees were from 8 to 12 feet high. When they were pruned in 1932 they were from 12 to 20 feet high and by 1937 they were 25 to 40 feet high and some of them measured 8 inches in diameter.

In the general discussion of means for converting Southern Maryland from its present character as a one-crop section, depending almost solely upon its tobacco, State Forester Besley expresses the opinion that the growing of pine trees for crops could be considerably expanded and that better profits could be made by the improvement in foresting methods.

Pine trees, says Mr. Besley, may be expected to grow as rapidly in Southern Maryland as they do in the States of the Far South. After some twelve years they are suitable for pulp wood, and, in some instances, pulp is already being sold to paper mills in Pennsylvania, while the more promising trees are preserved for timber. Turpentining is confined to the Far Southern States, but trees not used for pulp in the thinning process may provide firewood for farm consumption.

Since the above article was prepared there has come to our attention an announcement in the current issue of *The Manufacturer's Record* of the opening of a mill at Fernandina, Fla., which will be the first to produce commercial rayon pulp from Southern pine by means of the sulphite process. Thus still another use is added.

The mill will have an annual capacity of 64,000 tons and it will be fed by near-by stands of pine trees which, under a cutting and reforestry program, will insure a perpetual supply of wood. *The Manufacturer's Record* points out that the existing fourteen Southern plants for the making of rayon are capitalized in excess of $150,000,000, employ 50,000 people and produce 400,000,000 pounds of rayon yarn a year.

By an interesting coincidence, a dispatch from Little Rock, Ark., which says that yesterday *The Shreveport* (La.) *Times* and *The Little Rock Democrat* for the first time used newsprint made from pine pulp at the Lufkin (Texas) plant and report that it met every expectation.

Poslednaya Novosti, Paris

"I did that for you so that you may pass over, not that you should stay on top of me."

Chinese Women at War

—Condensed from The China Forum, *a weekly of Chungking, China*

Instead of powdering their faces or weeping over petty grievances, Chinese women are transforming themselves by innumerable services for the nation. Personal grievances pale into nothing beside the national grievance; to redress which tears are by no means as effective as a weapon. To avenge their husbands, brothers, or sons killed by the Japanese, Chinese women are fighting or helping Chinese men to fight.

Lipsticks give way to guns. Kwangsi is famous for its amazons, who can shoot and ride and use all sorts of arms as well as a man can. During air raids, they are out in the streets, before the raiders come, maintaining public order and helping the populace into the dugouts. When an army is on the way to the front, wives march shoulder to shoulder with husbands, carrying rifles and knapsacks.

In April last year, Hankow saw off a Kwangsi battalion of five hundred women soldiers, going to war. Five months later, when this battalion came back, only half of the number were greeted again by the inhabitants of Hankow. The other half had given their lives to the country!

Mother Chao Tung is the Chinese Joan of Arc of guerillas, having un-

Daily Herald, London

Aesop's Fables: The Wolf and the Lamb

der her command more than two thousand men—professors, university students, ex-bandits, released prisoners, and all patriots. These guerillas operate in units along the Peiping-Suiyuan Railway. The old lady is their generalissimo. The Japanese consider her an obstinate thorn in their flesh. On her gray head they have placed a high price. She has been responsible for many a surprise attack on Japanese military trains.

Miss Liu Huei (Graceful Willow) was a famous guerilla under the Mother of Guerillas. Her brother had been killed by a group of Japanese soldiers. After sufficient training by Mother Chao, Graceful Willow knew what she could do and set out to do it. One day, she disappeared—and never returned. Back in her village, Miss Willow, disguised as a beggar woman, too dirty to attract any Japanese soldier, went a-begging near a Japanese barrack. In her food basket there were two things under cover: a bomb and a knife. One evening while five Japanese soldiers were bearing down on her, chatting and laughing, Graceful Willow flung her bomb among the merry quintet. Then the knife—she put it through herself! When the Japanese rushed out from the barracks, it was too late to do her any harm.

We could count the different girls' wartime service corps by the hundreds, working near the front and in the rear. They perform wartime plays to entertain soldiers off duty and at the same time to inspire them to heroic deeds. For the villagers in general, the themes acted upon the stage deal mainly with the glory of joining the army to fight the enemy and the disgrace of traitors. It is propaganda, no doubt. But it is also civic education and entertainment in the crudest and yet most effective form.

The most famous wartime song, "The March of the Volunteers," runs from village to village. Heart and soul, the girls sing to appeal to the patriotic sense of the people. They sing for them and teach them to sing in their turn. When the army is marching to the front, the girls and the people sing together in chorus to increase its fighting spirit.

The girls receive radio news from sending stations, scribble up wall papers overnight, and post them on boards in the markets and streets. They conduct evening reading classes for the illiterate. They gather the village women and men together on public squares and speak to them on simple lessons of hygiene.

In the spring the farmers are busy sowing and in the autumn busy harvesting. The wartime service corps mobilizes all its members into shock brigades to assist the farmers. With sleeves tucked up and trousers rolled up, our girls go barefoot down to the paddy fields, and, standing knee-deep in the mud, set to work with scythes and hoes. When it is over, they emerge with limbs that look like lotus roots just pulled out of the mud from the bottom of the pond—where now are those lovely arms and ivory-skin legs which are the pride of our girls? Beauty is sacrificed to service, but fortunately by a little wash it is immediately restored.

Our girls also make garments for our soldiers at the front. Many of them sew brief messages of encouragement and their names in patches on the clothes so that the wearers will know the weavers and remember what they say. It is not unlikely that some of the soldiers will fall in love with these girls whom they hope they can meet some day, somewhere.

Holding Back the Flood

Herblock

Historic Herring

—Condensed from Animal and Zoo Magazine, *London*

The herring has been called the "fish which unmade empires."

The doctrine of the freedom of the seas rose out of the rival claims of Englishmen, Frenchmen, Flemings, Dutchmen, and Germans to pursue the priceless herring fisheries into each other's territorial waters.

The herring has obvious advantages over other fish; it has a rich, full taste, can be cured easily, and is abundant in coastal waters. An average shoal of herring covers six square miles, and in each square mile there are five hundred million fish. The female has a roe of 35,000 eggs, and shoals large enough to feed all the people in England for a year are not at all uncommon.

So in spite of gulls, whales, cod and dog-fish, in spite of all the fishing fleets of Western Europe, there is more food obtainable from a single acre of the North Sea than from a hundred of the best farmland in Norfolk. And there are more fish in that stretch of water than in all the other seas of Europe put together.

Before the war of 1914-18 our annual export trade in herrings was worth six million pounds. It varies now between five and four. But the herring is still an important element in our national wealth, and now that blockading submarines attempt to intercept our food supplies it may again make history.

The War to Date

—From The Canadian Forum, *a monthly, of Trenton, Ontario*

Perhaps Schrecklichkeit will have started by the time these lines appear; but when they were written people in England were referring to it as the Bore War and someone in the States had dubbed it the Great Word War.

Conversation Book

—From News Review, *London*

Ready for the day the British army rumbles over the Reich's frontier, a Soldier's English-German Conversation Book was put on sale last week. Useful for the occupation of a town are such soothing phrases as "Fear nothing, our men don't loot!" and "Sorry to disturb you, we don't touch women and children."

The billeted soldier is taught how to say "I hope my bed is clean" and "Don't forget me." The shopping section unaccountably gives "Two yards of black elastic." Matey conversation includes such sayings as "After the fight, enemies must be friends," "German beer is good," "I love my old pipe," and "I have a little wife at home."

Final flourish unlikely to be popular with unemotional Tommies is *Wir Britten singen, von ganzem herzen, Gott erhalte unsern Koenig!* ("We Britons sing, with all our hearts, God Save the King!")

Submarine Hunting

—Condensed from an article in The London Daily Telegraph and Morning Post *by Admiral Sir Howard Kelly, who commanded the British Adriatic Force in 1918*

A submarine has two sets of engines, usually Diesel engines which give her a good speed on the surface, and electric motors for use when she is submerged. While diving, her speed is very much reduced, and her endurance and radius of action are strictly limited, as she has to come up to the surface to recharge her batteries with her main motors. Therefore, the first principle of submarine-hunting is to "keep her down."

This can be done by the employment of unlimited small craft, but the requisite numbers cannot justifiably be maintained in peace time, and a large proportion of them can only be built after war has actually started.

The defensive arming of merchant ships also helps. It ensures that they shall not be sunk by U-boat gunfire; instead, they must be attacked with the more expensive torpedo, of which only a limited number can be carried.

You can sight a submarine on the surface, but when submerged she can only be heard, and that at a limited distance. During the last war, echo-

ranging, echo-sounding, and the various forms of fixed and mobile hydrophones for the location of submarines were invented.

Destroyers and other anti-submarine craft fitted with these appliances obtain by sound a line of bearing on the submarine, and two such lines crossing indicate its position. They close at full speed on these lines of bearing and attack with bouquets of depth charges, which are small mines set by hydrostatic valves to explode at various depths. They are either dropped or thrown by depth-charge throwers.

To carry out an attack on a ship, a submarine takes up a position on the line of advance of that ship, which she has to calculate—preferably before submerging. To make calculation as complicated as possible ships zigzag a varying number of degrees each side of the normal course, with a varying interval on each course, which makes it much more difficult for the submarine to get in a shot. When possible, valuable ships have an anti-submarine screen of destroyers spread on an arc on the line of advance and at such a distance as to prevent a submarine from putting up her periscope in an attacking position. High speed is also a valuable protection.

Control of traffic is an essential feature in anti-submarine work. Ships are either routed by widely different routes so that the risks are spread—in which case they are protected only when in the danger zone —or they can be concentrated in convoy and receive protection throughout the voyage. Convoy, of course, entails great loss of time and means that many ships cannot profit by the higher speed for which they have been built.

Camouflage also was helpful in the last war. This form of disguise makes ships more difficult to sight, especially through a periscope. A false bow-wave painted on the stem will give a wrong impression of the speed. In the last war ships were also built "double-ended," so that it was hard to tell their direction.

It is extraordinary how much punishment a submarine can take and still struggle home to her base; but every depth charge that is dropped near a submarine has its cumulative effect and is slowly but surely reducing the efficiency of the most dangerous weapon that can be brought against an island power.

Chronology of the European War

JANUARY 19—Norway and Denmark again declare their neutrality but state that if necessary they will defend their independence by military means.
—Swedish volunteers, both pilots and land fighters, aid Finns in repelling Soviet troops.

JANUARY 20—Winston Churchill, First Lord of the British Admiralty, asks neutrals for "united action" with the Allies in the war against Germany. British rejects a protest by the U. S. over the seizure of American mails, seeing "clear evidence of . . . an organized traffic in contraband on considerable scale between German sympathizers in America and Germany through the mail."
—Pope Pius XII hails President Roosevelt's offers to assist in efforts to halt the war but cautious of the "slight probability of success so long as the present state of the opposing forces remains essentially unchanged.

JANUARY 21—Intensification of the war at sea results in the loss of the British destroyer *Grenville*, which struck a mine or was torpedoed, taking the lives of eighty-one men.
—A British cruiser stops the Japanese liner *Asama Maru* thirty-five miles off the Japanese coast and removes twenty-one German merchant seamen en route to Germany via Japan and Siberia.
—Washington studies Britain's curtailment on purchases of American tobacco, cotton, wheat and fruits.

JANUARY 22—The U. S makes public a strong note demanding that British cease unduly long detentions of American ships for contraband examination
—Tokyo warns London that removal of Nazi seamen from the *Asama Maru* was "a serious unfriendly act."
—Armed German forces appear at the Rumanian frontier of Russian-occupied Poland under an agreement with Moscow by which the Nazis are allowed to police railroads linking Rumania and Germany.

JANUARY 23—The British destroyer *Exmouth* is sunk with her crew of 175.
—Assistant Secretary of State Berle declares relations between the U. S. and Japan will continue on a day-to-day basis after the expiration of the 1911 commercial treaty.

JANUARY 24—The Finns report halting repeated Russian attacks as a Senate Committee in Washington clears the way for a $20,000,000 additional loan to Finland.
—Tokyo abandons last minute efforts to find some working agreement to replace the American-Japanese trade treaty, and accuses Washington of a concerted effort to wreck Japan's program for the creation of a New Order in East Asia.

JANUARY 25—Canadian Parliament dissolved after a three hour session with the Mackenzie King Cabinet facing a bitter attack over its conduct of the war It is decided to call an election.
—Germany announces that the pocket battleship, *Deutschland* has broken through the British blockade and returned home after raiding merchant shipping on the Atlantic ever since the outbreak of the war.

JANUARY 26—The quiet on the Western Front is broken when big guns duel in the Vosges Mountains.
—The German envoys to the Balkan countries confer with Chancellor Hitler in Berlin. The talks are termed "routine."
—Questioned concerning American volunteers for Finland, President Roosevelt says that those enlisting in the forces of a foreign nation would not lose their citizenship unless they took an oath of allegiance to that nation.

JANUARY 27—First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill tells a crowd in Manchester that he hopes soon to see Britain wrest the initiative from Germany.
—Following a five-day continuous debate, ending with an all-night session, the South African House of Assembly defeats the motion of General Hertzog, former Premier, to halt the war with Germany. The government's majority of twenty-two votes was more than had been expected.

JANUARY 28—Auguste Cardinal Hlond, Primate of Poland, submits a report to the Vatican giving details of mass shootings, plundering and persecutions in conquered Poland.
—Japanese military authorities tighten the blockade around the British and French concessions in Tientsin, presumably to show their displeasure over the Asama Maru incident.

JANUARY 29—In the most extensive aerial operation of the war, German planes bomb and machine-gun shipping over 400 miles of British coastline while submarines attack with torpedoes.
—Russian planes rain more than one thousand bombs on Southern Finnish cities.
—Premier Daladier, in a radio address, says the Nazis seek domination of the world, with "systematic and total destruction of the vanquished and slavery of the people."

JANUARY 30—Chancellor Hitler, in a surprise speech, proclaims that the first phase of the war—political and military preparation, and conquest of Poland—is complete and that Germany is now ready to carry the war to the West on land, in the air and on the sea. Nazi aviators make a second visit to the British east coast and report their bombs and guns have sunk eighteen ships in two days.

JANUARY 31—Prime Minister Chamberlain, addressing the United States, says Britain intends to return to freer trade at the war's end, and gives assurance to Japan that the seizure of Nazi seamen from a Japanese ship implied no "want of courtesy."

—Foreign Minister Arita, disclaiming any intention by Japan to eliminate "legitimate rights and interests" of the U. S. and other third powers in China, tells the Diet that, with the establishment of the New Order in China, America will profit there.

FEBRUARY 1—Russia launches a new attack against Finland's Mannerheim Line, using bombing planes, armored sleds, tanks and smoke screens.

—President Kallio of Finland, speaking to the final solemn session of the War Diet, urges an end to the "senseless and barbaric war" and offers to conclude "an honorable peace."

—Former Kaiser Wilhelm II, in a letter to a friend in New York, says he believes the western nations should make peace and join in an attack to crush Soviet Russia.

—Foreign Minister Saracoglu of Turkey, on the eve of the Balkan Entente meeting in Belgrade, declares his country is "not neutral but merely out of the war."

—Japan formally demands that Britain return twenty-one German seamen removed from the *Asama Maru*.

FEBRUARY 2—The Foreign Ministers of the Balkan Entente—Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey and Rumania—agree at the opening of their meeting in Belgrade to keep their countries out of the war.

—Hundreds of Russian parachutists, dropping from planes behind the Mannerheim Line, are shot in mid-air or captured by the Finns.

—Moscow's answer to President Kallio's peace offer is a threat "to exterminate the Finnish bandits."

—Reports of unrest on the northwest Indian frontier are received in London.

FEBRUARY 3—While Russia's big guns pound the fortifications of the Mannerheim Line, Soviet fliers strike their most destructive blow of the war at Finland's towns.

—Twenty German bombers raid England's east coast.

FEBRUARY 4—For the third day in Russia's fiercest offensive against the Mannerheim Line, the Red troops are held in check by the Finns.

—Concluding the meeting of the Balkan Entente, Grigore Gafencu, Rumanian Foreign Minister, tells foreign correspondents that Yugoslavia, Turkey, Rumania and Greece are determined to maintain peace and order in southeastern Europe.

FEBRUARY 5—The Canadian Pacific freighter *Beaverburn*, 9,874 tons, is torpedoed and sunk.

—Leaders of the allied civil and military forces meet in Paris to study war problems, particularly that of supply.

—Tokyo rejects Britain's offer to release nine of the twenty-one German seamen seized from the liner *Asama Maru* by a British warship, insisting that all twenty-one be freed.

FEBRUARY 6—There is nervousness in the Near East in the expectation of a Russo-German drive toward the Persian Gulf. It is reported that an "army of the Orient" has been massed, with French forces commanded by General Maxime Weygand and a British army under Lieutenant General Sir Archibald Wavell.

—Scandinavia hears that Germany might seek to mediate between Finland and Russia, at the same time offering a six-point peace plan to the Allies, but this is denied in Berlin.

—Food Minister W. S. Morrison of Britain announces that fresh meat will be added to the list of ration foods, which already includes sugar, butter, ham and bacon. The limit per week for each person over six will be a pound to a pound and a half of fresh meat, including bone and fat.

—Prime Minister Chamberlain announces a partial settlement of the dispute over seizure of Germans from a Japanese liner, with Japanese shipping companies agreeing not to carry subjects of belligerent countries who are believed to be in the armed forces.

FEBRUARY 7—A Senate committee approves a plan to allow Finland to borrow $20,000,000 more from the United States. The House comes within three votes of a decision that, in effect, would have broken relations with the Soviet by refusing to grant expenses for the upkeep of an Embassy in Moscow.

—The Japanese Parliament is told that the government is preparing for "anticipated difficulties" in its economic relations with the United States and is considering the problem of abrogating the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922.

FEBRUARY 8—Fritz Thyssen, who was head of the Ruhr Steel and Iron Trust and Germany's greatest industrialist until November 1939, and who was largely responsible for placing Hitler in power, predicts that the Hitler regime in Germany is doomed, according to reports from Switzerland where Thyssen lives in exile.

—Moscow announces that the Red army has broken through the Mannerheim Line and has captured thirteen forts in the Finnish defense system. The reports are denied in Helsinki.

—Germany is dealt a blow in the Near East when Turkey suddenly confiscates the Krupp shipyards on the Golden Horn, an arm of the Bosphorus.

—Secretary of State Hull voices the opinion that Soviet Russia "might have violated obligations" to this country, but does not suggest that a break with Moscow is in order.

—Three thousand members of the American Youth Congress arrive in Washington to stage a "monster lobby for jobs, peace, civil liberties, education, and health."

FEBRUARY 9—President Roosevelt launches a dual drive for restoration of peace in Europe. He commissions Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles to conduct conversations with European powers. At the same time, Secretary Hull reveals that the sentiment of neutrals is being sounded out.

—Although the Russians continue to pound at the Mannerheim Line, the Finns insist that they have repulsed all attacks.

—Turkey ousts eighty German technicians from defense industries giving them forty-eight hours to leave the country.

—The American Youth Congress, charged with being unduly influenced by Communist elements within it, opens a four-day session in Washington.

FEBRUARY 10—President Roosevelt condemns Soviet Russia as a dictatorship and accuses it of brutally invading Finland in a speech to American Youth Congress members. The Department of Commerce discloses that Russian imports from the United States have increased since the undeclared war in Finland began.

—The French Chamber of Deputies gives Premier Daladier a unanimous vote of confidence as the fighting grows fiercer on the Western Front.

FEBRUARY 11—One of the greatest forces ever transported by sea lands in

Suez, Egypt, from New Zealand and Australia to join British-French forces in the Near East. From Istanbul, Turkey, come reports that 30,000 men have arrived after a secret journey of 10,000 miles.
—Helsinki reports that "several enemy divisions" are launching an artillery tank and aircraft attack against Finnish positions in the Summa section of the Isthmus of Karelia, and that the battle is continuing with great intensity for the eleventh day.
—As Britain reaches a new trade agreement with Turkey, Italian-Turkish trade agreements also near completion.

FEBRUARY 12—The Russian army continues to blast, with increasing severity, at the Mannerheim Line. Observers believe that the Soviet is seeking a military showdown on the Karelian Isthmus.
—An attempted dash through the British blockade by the richly laden German freighter *Wakama* ends in scuttling, when a British cruiser attempts to capture the prize. The crew of forty-six is taken aboard the cruiser.
—Extreme cold prevents land action on the Western Front, but reconnaissance planes are active on both sides.

FEBRUARY 13—Despite strong vocal opposition which vanished when the final vote was called for, the Senate passes, 49-27, a bill which proposes to advance up to $20,000,000 in new export credits to Finland and perhaps as much as $20,000,000 additional to China.
—The Russo-Finnish war reaches a severity that recalls the worst days of the World War, and fear is expressed that the Finnish forces may not be able to hold out as the Red Army hurls more troops against the Mannerheim Line. The Finns ask the world for assistance.
—This country's greatest peacetime Navy Supply Bill is placed before the House and, despite a committee slash of $112,000,000, it allocates $967,000,000 to bolster our "first line of defense."

FEBRUARY 14—Finns admit Red gains, but claim only dents have been made in the Mannerheim Line and that no serious damage has been done. Men forty-two and forty-three years of age are called to the colors. London announces that restrictions have been lifted on British enlistments in the Finnish Army.
—The Japanese South China Command calls on General Chiang Kai-shek to surrender, declaring that Japan has conquered enough territory to support the Japanese sponsored government of Wang Ching-wei.
—The House Committee on Naval Affairs, by a unanimous vote, approves the $654,902,270 Naval Expansion Bill.
—The British Navy claims to have sunk two German U-boats after two oil tankers and a refrigerator ship are sunk by Germans.

FEBRUARY 15—Britain offers to convoy all neutral ships regardless of destination.
—President Roosevelt sets out from Florida on a cruise amid rumors that he will meet at sea British, French and Italian high officials.
—Finnish forces are reported withdrawing from first-line positions at a number of points in the Summa sector on the Karelian Isthmus.
—China claims that it is forcing the Japanese army to retreat in campaigns at opposite ends of the country.

FEBRUARY 16—Russian Army drives past Summa, claims 53 more forts. Finns admit retreat but claim their main line is still unbroken. Swedes refuse to give Finns military aid.
—British destroyer *Intrepid* seizes the German steamer *Altmark* inside Norwegian waters near Bergen and places a prize crew aboard.

FEBRUARY 17—British raid the *Altmark* in Norwegian waters, killing four Germans and freeing 326 *Spee* prisoners. Oslo protests and Berlin is ablaze with wrath.
—Reds continue gains in Finland, but Finns claim a smashing victory over a Russian ski unit on the Eastern front.
—Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles and Myron C. Taylor, personal envoy of President Roosevelt to the Vatican, sail for Europe aboard the Italian steamer *Rex* on their "peace mission."

FEBRUARY 18—British call Norway remiss in duty; demand explanation on *Altmark;* Berlin warns neutrals to halt "excesses."
—Reds claim cutting off Karelian coast fort in new gains; also claim capture of two towns. Finns admit troops withdrawing.

FEBRUARY 19—Berlin reports an attack on four enemy convoys, sinking a destroyer and freight and tank ships.
—The Finns claim the annihilation of the Red Army's 18th Division with 18,900 men killed or taken prisoner.
—Paris reports casualties are sustained on the Western front when French troops "stumbled into an ambush."

The St. Lawrence Waterway

(Continued from page 29)

be higher than that of the most efficiently managed of all private plants.

We have had many experiences with government expenditures for the improvement of our inland waterways. The history of the results generally reveals a story of never-ending waste of taxpayers' money.

Upon the Ohio River, the Federal government has spent very large sums of money—for the transportation of low grade commodities. The total cost per ton of this traffic, if we include all items of cost that should be included, is twice as large as the railroad rates on the same or similar commodities.

On the upper Mississippi River traffic, the Federal taxpayers are investing three times as much as the railroad rates on the very same or similar traffic. On the Missouri River, they are now spending many hundreds of times as much as the railroad rates.

The old Erie Canal yielded a considerable return on New York State's investment in it. During much of its lifetime, there was a scarcity of transportation between the Hudson River and the Great Lakes. The new Barge Canal represents a public investment of over $250,000,000; and it costs the taxpayers of New York State about two dollars for each ton of freight which moves on it and most of it is only low grade commodities.

In my judgment, a Federal investment in the transformation of the St. Lawrence River above Montreal into a seaway would be another example of vast waste of taxpayers' money upon waterways which are not now needed by the United States shippers and receivers of freight and which in all probability will not be needed at all in the future years.

As for those who plead for the St. Lawrence Ocean Waterway as a measure of national defense, they seem to forget that a waterway which runs a thousand miles through a foreign country may easily become a serious defense liability to the United States.

The Civilian Can Take It

(Continued from page 35)

flage experts, as trucks, tanks, armored cars, troop trains, battleships, planes, cannon, staff cars and motorcycles blossom forth with crazy-quilt designs in reds, blues, greens and ochres. Shop windows are also being decorated with fancy camouflage while in Berlin's Unter den Linen sandbags with lavender stripes give an artistic touch to otherwise drab protective measures.

Among the strangest aspects of inventiveness attributable to the war are the uses to which pigs, elephants, camels and spiders are being put. The French have sent pigs out along the path of their advance to explode German mines. The Germans are experimenting with elephants as replacements for tractors on farms. A school has been opened to train camels to pull German plows and wagons while cows have been conscripted for farm work to replace horses. The British have enlisted a certain kind of spider to spin fine webs for use in the sights of optical instruments attached to the firing controls of big guns.

The current hit songs in London, as was to be expected, are keyed to the war. To the tune of "Pack Up Your Troubles in Your Old Kit Bag," Londoners are now singing "Hanging Out the Washing on the Siegfried Line," and "Pack Up Your Goebbels in Your Old Kit Bag and Heil, Heil, Heil." Another war song that has caught the public fancy is "Run, Adolf, Run."

In Germany, owners of phonographs cannot buy new records unless they turn in an equivalent number of old ones. To take the people's mind off blackouts, the German radio broadcasts concerts during the blacked-out hours. Radio listening, however, can be risky business in Germany; persons caught listening to foreign programs are liable to severe penalties.

Movies and theatres in London, Berlin and Paris were closed at night early in the war but they are now reopened, although performances must end by 11 P.M. Public dancing in Germany, verboten for many weeks, is now permitted from 7 to midnight. In England, the "blackout stroll" is a new dance born of wartime necessity. It starts like the Lambeth Walk. Then the lights in the ballroom go out and everybody changes partners. The idea is to give shy girls a chance to get acquainted with handsome men in uniform.

Amusements, too, have been adapted to the war. For sixpence, a Londoner or Parisian can obey the impulse to work off his hate against Hitler, Goering, Ribbentrop or some other Nazi bigwig. Shooting galleries feature targets that are figures of Nazi notables.

The most popular toys for children are also reflections of the war. In fact, the Western Front has been transferred in miniature to German, French and British playrooms. German youngsters play with toy soldiers made of a pliable elastic material that can be bent into any desired posture for drills, marches, skirmishes or battles. Toy soldiers can be had in all poses, throwing hand grenades, aiming rifles, falling, resting, and even dead.

Toy barbed wire fences, metal soldiers with a mechanism which explodes a hand grenade, toy airplane bombs are other 1940 playthings in Europe. English children are being habituated to war by miniature big guns which throw wooden shells, by balloon barrages, mobile tanks and realistic battlefields complete with shell holes and stretcher bearers. A toy popular with adults has two wooden figures representing Chamberlain and Hitler. When the toy moves, Chamberlain hits Hitler with an umbrella.

As the war drags on, the civilian populations will find themselves making more and more adjustments in their daily lives. Devices and practices that at first they greeted with amusement or amazement are now an accepted part of their equipment and daily routine. Perhaps after the war people will laugh at them again as humorous reminders of an era that today seems anything but funny.

Congress Passes a Bill

(Continued from page 20)

can outtalk the clock, a session may expire without taking action on the measure to which he is opposed. Huey Long staged the last notable one-man filibuster, but a group of Senators, yielding the floor only to one another, ran a disguised filibuster against repeal of the arms embargo.

Since the final vote on a measure is usually determined in advance, by party politics, by conference behind the scenes, and very largely by confidence of Congress in the wisdom of its own committees, spectators in the galleries wonder what purpose is served by the long hours of debate on the floor. They see a Senator rolling out rhetoric to an almost empty and completely inattentive chamber and they know his speech will rarely change a single colleague's vote. But Congressional debate, besides helping the members impress their constituents, has a democratic value. It educates the voters on national issues and it often builds up a weight of public opinion which does in time alter votes on the floor.

In the House, with its 435 members, unlimited debate like the Senate's would be utterly impractical. Hence the limit of one hour for any one speaker on one subject.

House leaders have their devices, too, for pushing pet measures ahead. The Rules Committee can suspend the regular rules in order to consider a measure out of its turn.

Most mystifying of all Congressional devices is the House resolving itself into a "Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union," to consider a major bill. The Speaker's chair is taken by some veteran member well versed in parliamentary procedure. A different set of rules now prevails. The "Committee" specifies a time limit for general debate and then a clerk reads the bill, paragraph by paragraph, for amendments. These may be offered ad infinitum, except that no member may offer two amendments to the same section. Members may not speak more than five minutes on each amendment. Voting on amendments is by "voice" as in the Senate, or, if 20 members demand it, the Chairman appoints two Congressmen to act as tellers. Members favoring the amendment then pass down the aisle and are counted. Next, members opposed parade and are counted. Thus votes are anonymous. Sometimes this anonymity is pierced to the great embarrassment of certain members; reporters in the press gallery have pooled their efforts and made an almost perfect record of teller votes —a remarkable feat, to spot several hundred men by name in the time it takes them to walk down an aisle.

When all amendments have been considered, the "Committee" again becomes the House. Some opponent moves to "recommit" the bill—send it back to committee, in effect killing it for the session. The House passes on this motion. If the motion is rejected, roll call on passage of the bill follows.

A bill passed by one chamber is "messaged" to the other. A Senate clerk, for instance, comes to the House. Obtaining recognition from the Speaker, he announces that the Senate has passed a measure in which the concurrence of the House is requested. All this is most ceremonious, the clerk bowing stiffly before and after his announcement.

No measure can become law until both Senate and House have passed identical bills. When their versions vary, as often, each chamber appoints three or five conferees to try to adjust differences. They cannot introduce new matter, must try to compromise within the limits set by the difference between the two bills. When a compromise has been reached, the conferees send their report to their respective Houses. Conference reports cannot be amended and they cannot be debated; they must be passed or defeated as is.

The bill is now ready to be enrolled as an Act of Congress, i.e., printed on parchment. Signed by the Speaker and the Vice President, it goes to the President, who has ten days, not counting Sundays, in which to act upon it. He may sign it, whereupon it is law; or he may veto it, sending it back with a message explaining his action. To override the President's veto, Congress must repass the bill by a two-thirds vote of both Houses. If the President fails to act within the ten-day limit, the bill automatically becomes law. If, however, Congress should end its session during this ten day period, the measure automatically dies. This is the "pocket veto," a device adopted by all Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt. It saves the work of writing veto messages in the busy closing days of a session, and it enables a President to kill a distasteful bill without making a public statement that might embarrass him.

Once the bill has become law, it must then stand its chance with the lawyers and the Federal courts—and that is another story. Congress, at least, has done its hard, thankless and necessary job.

A Londoner Looks at Hollywood

(Continued from page 41)

conditions of the building. The employment of this elasticity of method becomes practically automatic with an experienced actor. The mechanical devices of the cinema bring the audience quite close to the actor, so that the broad manner of the large theater would be an over-accentuation. But the actor does not have to discard anything that he has learned on the stage: his technique remains the same; it is merely a matter of how to employ it.

If you are acting for the screen you say to yourself: "Here is my audience, in the front row; they can see my most fleeting expression and my slightest movement. I need not force anything upon their notice—"; but you use all the art you have learned from the stage—it is merely a matter of degree. That, at any rate, is my opinion.

I do not pretend to know as much about the public taste as those producers who have made large fortunes by their successful choice of subjects, but I am convinced that there is only one definition of "What the public wants" and that is—something really good. The public doesn't know what it wants until it gets it. Why don't they want historical pictures? The reason seems to me obvious. After a surfeit of, let us say, gangster stories, some astute producer brings out a fine historical picture which is a great success. Instantly the word goes round, "This is what the public wants," and out from the studios go research parties with shovels and picks, to dig up all of the old bodies in Westminster Abbey, sort out those who look the freshest, and make a frantic effort at resuscitation. A great many historical stories are quickly written to order, some of them good, but most of them much inferior to the original success. When people have seen a succession of poor imitations, they cease to go, and historical films become Poison at the Box Office. People didn't flock to the first one because it was an historical film, but because it was a good picture. They stayed away from the others because they were *not* good pictures.

And then of course there is always Production Value. You may not know what Production Value is. I didn't know for a long time. Well, Production Value can only be attained by spending a lot of money unnecessarily, just as a man who wishes to make a great impression might put on three diamond studs; he is a very ordinary man, but he doesn't want you to know that.

I am hoping the time is not far distant when Production Value will cease to be considered necessary. I am in favor of beautiful settings when they belong to the story; and I fully realize that although change of scene is of no special importance in the regular theater, it is vitally necessary in the cinema. My objection to Production Value is that it has the habit of crashing in without being invited; that it holds up the interest; that it breaks the continuity of the story by the sheer weight of its magnificence. There is perhaps another reason for restraint in the introduction of these super-gorgeous settings. The audience is becoming a spoilt child; it is being given too much. It not only doesn't gasp when shown a scene that costs thousands, it ceases to notice it. Or, at any rate, it doesn't remember it when it leaves the cinema.

In my opinion, expenses in nearly all branches of the picture business are too high. Picture houses are too costly, advertising can be ruinous; the army of middlemen in all departments must be a perpetual drain. Although there is today nothing like the waste there was in the "old days," there is something wrong when every feature picture has to be rated either a "knock-out" or "a flop." I am aware that I am laying myself open to criticism in discussing the managerial side of pictures—a part of the business in which I have had no real experience, but I venture to do so because of my practical knowledge of audiences and their taste. I have had long experience with the public and believe them to have simple tastes; by simple I mean ingenuous and unsophisticated, and that they are neither entertained nor amused by Production Value.

Mr. Arliss is the author of a forthcoming book, My Ten Years at the Studios, *to be published in April by Little, Brown & Co.*

Travel

Historic Virginia

N. CLARENCE SMITH

TODAY Americans are seeking as never before a re-interpretation of their own form of government. They are not questioning the values of democracy. Rather, they are looking back to the days from whence came these great principles of self-government, and, with a receptive and sympathetic mind, are seeking to renew their faith, devotion and enthusiasm for them.

It is natural that their thoughts should turn toward the State of Virginia. There, in 1607, the old Dominion saw the birth of our nation. A brave band of Englishmen, dissatisfied with things at home and seeking new worlds to conquer, set sail for a new land and on May 13, dropped anchor at a point in Virginia which they called Jamestown. There they established the first permanent English settlement in the new world and this marked the beginnings of our nation. Previous attempts at colonization elsewhere in America had failed. The Virginia colony survived—and created the foundation of our democracy. It is of great importance that in 1619, the men at Jamestown, assembling in the first church, established the first representative legislative assembly in the new world. This was the genesis of our great system of representative government.

A few miles from Jamestown is Williamsburg, the restored city. Settled in 1633 as a palisadèd barrier against Indians, it became the capital of Virginia in 1699 and received its name in honor of William III of England. Incorporated as a city in 1722, it was the center of Virginia's leadership and influence throughout the period preceding the American Revolution. It was the capital of Virginia until the seat of government was removed to Richmond in 1779.

Thousands go to Williamsburg to see the magnificently restored buildings and gardens which carry present-day Americans back two hundred years. Antique furniture and other furnishings representative of the period in Williamsburg are having a great influence today on the trend of American furniture and architecture.

The gardens and interiors of the Palace of the Royal Governors, the reconstructed Capitol, Raleigh Tavern and many other restored structures are interesting, but the real lesson in restored Williamsburg lies in the slogan behind the Williamsburg Restoration, "That the Future May Learn from the Past." It means much to Americans that in the reconstructed Capitol, George Mason presented his famous Virginia Bill of Rights. This Bill of Rights, with few changes, is now a part of the American Constitution, where it appeared at the demand of Virginians who refused to permit the Commonwealth to become a part of the union until these rights were so acknowledged.

A few steps from the Capitol is the Raleigh Tavern. It is noteworthy that the Phi Beta Kappa fraternity was most probably founded in the original tavern, yet of greater importance is the fact that here dinner table conversations of Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry and other Revolutionary celebrities led to the basic principles behind the American Revolution. In fact, in Williamsburg they say somewhat lightly that the Revolution was "hatched" in the Raleigh Tavern.

Take a little walk further up the Duke of Gloucester Street and one comes to the College of William and Mary, second oldest institution of higher learning in the nation. Here Thomas Jefferson and a host of other great Americans had their schooling.

British rule in America began at Jamestown, yet it is an unusual coincidence that British rule was ended in our country only about twenty miles from the first settlement. At Yorktown, Cornwallis surrendered to Washington, closing the American Revolution and assuring the American colonies of their independence. Thus, the Colonial National Historical Park, embracing a part of Jamestown, nearly all of Yorktown and a connecting parkway is aptly termed "the alpha and omega of British rule in America." Restored fortifications, a museum of relics, old Grace Church built of oyster shells, the Moore House where the terms of surrender were drawn, and the Nelson House or York Hall are among the more important historic possessions at Yorktown, which recall the final days of the American Revolution.

Overlooking the broad Potomac River are two historic shrines which are dear to all Americans. "Wakefield," is the restored birthplace of the First Citizen of all, George Washington. True, the original structure burned to the ground in 1780 and the present building represents only something of the original, but that matters little. The important thing is the fact that the father of our country was born on the estate. The building now contains furniture of the period, some of which belonged to the Washington family.

Near "Wakefield," is Stratford, ancestral home of the Lees of Virginia and birthplace of General Robert E. Lee. From the Revolutionary era to the birthday of General Lee, this estate was the rendezvous of great Americans, many of whom played leading roles in shaping our Constitution. Stratford today is still a fine Virginia estate. The home has been repaired and furnished with period furnishings, the gardens have also been restored, and the farm is operated much as it was in the heyday of the estate.

The most sacred ground in all America is Mount Vernon, home and final resting place of George Washington, on Virginia soil overlooking the Potomac River near Washington. Here, somewhat secluded from the cares of war and state, the first president lived the life of a gentleman farmer and prepared some of his great papers. The Mansion and its dependencies are kept today as much as possible as Washington maintained them.

Just outside of Washington is Arlington Cemetery, final resting place of many outstanding Americans and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. With military precision, an American sentry paces back and forth in front of the tomb, guarding not only the rich, white marble, but also the spirit of him who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of the American way of life.

Fredericksburg was the boyhood home of George Washington, and may rightly lay claim as "America's Most Historic City." Most notable of its historic shrines is Kenmore, beautiful colonial home of the Revolutionary patriot, Colonel Fielding Lewis, and his wife, Betty, sister of George Washington.

Echoes of a great President's days might be heard at the James Monroe Law Office, where Monroe worked as a struggling attorney and member of the town council. Here marked the beginnings of a career which finally brought him to the White House. Today his Monroe Doctrine is playing a vital role in our Latin-American policy.

RICHMOND, Capital of the State and Capital of the Old South, is rich in American history. Outstanding among her historic buildings is St. John's Church in the eastern section of the city. A simple, frame structure, used much for the assembly of patriots, it is best known because on a March day in 1775 Patrick Henry, speaking in the presence of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and other patriots, made his famous oration ending, "Give me liberty or give me death!" This speech fired the flames of the American Revolution and solidified Virginia sentiment for the war.

The White House of the Confederacy, in Richmond, was the home of Jefferson Davis when he was president of the Confederate States of America. Today it is a museum, housing priceless relics of the Lost Cause, with a separate room dedicated to the relics of each Southern state.

The Capitol is the most visited shrine in the city. In it meets the oldest representative assembly in the new world. In the rotunda is the famous Houdon statue of George Washington, regarded as his best likeness in stone. Surrounding the statue are busts of Virginia-born presidents. In the restored hall of the House of Delegates, General Lee accepted command of the armed forces of Virginia and in this same building, Aaron Burr was tried for treason, with Chief Justice John Marshall presiding. And nearby, too, is the home of the great Chief Justice.

The little town of Charlottesville is surrounded by some of America's most famous landmarks. Go into your pocket, if you will, and take out a new five-cent piece. On one side you find Thomas Jefferson's head and on the other side a view of Monticello, his mountaintop home near the city. Monticello was planned by Jefferson, who also superintended its construction. Magnificently located, it preserves even to this day some of his unique but useful inventions. "All my wishes end where I hope my days will end at Monticello," wrote Jefferson of this home where some of the happiest days of his life were spent and where he lies buried. On his tomb is this simple inscription which he himself prepared: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom and Father of the University of Virginia." It should be highly significant to present-day Americans, who make pilgrimages to this shrine, that although Jefferson served twice as president of the United States, he did not think sufficiently of his labor in this field to have this service recorded on his tomb. Near Monticello is Ash Lawn, home of James Monroe, and in Charlottesville is the University of Virginia, which Jefferson founded and where Woodrow Wilson once taught.

Staunton, a small city in the famous Shenandoah Valley area, claims the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson as well as the first city in the country to adopt the city manager form of government.

Thirty-five miles from Staunton is Lexington, seat of Washington and Lee University and the Virginia Military Institute. George Washington helped establish the university and endowed it, and after the Civil War, General R. E. Lee became its president. In the little chapel on the university campus, General Lee and many members of his family are buried and over Lee's tomb is the famous Valentine recumbent statue, truly a great work of art. V. M. I. is often called "The West Point of the South," for it was modeled after the famous Academy.

As the visitor travels along Virginia's smooth-surfaced highways, he can read history while he rides. Approximately twelve hundred markers have been erected in recent years along the main arteries, each telling a very brief story of the historic importance of the place near which the marker is located. Realizing that most motorists do not have time to stop and read, the Virginia Conservation Commission has published a booklet listing the inscriptions on each marker. These are placed in the booklet in their order along the highways, so that it is possible to read the inscriptions by noting the large key numbers on each marker and referring to the booklet.

A favorite time for visiting Virginia is during Garden Week, to be held this year April 22-27. During this period, approximately 100 beautiful homes and gardens are open to the public. Many of these estates, being private residences, are only open during Garden Week, which is handled by the Garden Club of Virginia.

Thus, from the very beginnings of the nation at Jamestown in 1607, to the world war and beyond, when the Virginia-born President Woodrow Wilson was in the White House, Virginia history has been closely linked with that of the nation. The lessons her native sons have left are vividly recalled to the visitor at her hundreds of historic shrines, to which she invites all to come for a reawakening of the ideals and principles on which the American government was founded.

Index and Table of Contents

SEPTEMBER, 1939 — MARCH, 1940

ADLER, Lawrence, Travel, Nov. 63
ALLEN, W. Dangaix, Ghandhi Balks Again, Dec. 25
ALLEN, Robert S., Wheeler and the Liberals, March 25
AMERICA and the War, Oct. 35
Radio: Covering the Crisis, Oct. 35
Washington: America & Neutrality, Oct. 39
Can and Should America Stay Out of War? Oct. 42
American Business and the War, Nov. 26
Our New Arms Program, Jan. 33
AMERICA: Toward the American Dream, Dec. 41
American Politics in High Gear, Jan. 28
The National Pocketbook, Feb. 18
Uncle Sam Counts Noses, Feb. 36
ARLISS, George, A Londoner Looks at Hollywood, March 39
ARMS, Jan. 33
ARTS and the War, Jan. 42
ASIA Draws Its Sword, Feb. 17
AS the War Begins, Oct. 30

BARKLEY, Frederick R., Martin Dies of Texas, Dec. 29
BEALS, Carleton, Latin America & the War, Jan. 25
BOOKS, Sept. 1, Oct. 1, Nov. 1, Dec. 1, Jan. 1, Feb. 1, March 1
BUREAUCRACY Rules the Navy, March 30
BUSINESS, Sept. 50, Nov. 29, Business Faces the Forties, Jan. 39

CALIFORNIA, Oct. 58
CAN Hitler Invade America?, Dec 18
CHAIN of Broken Promises, A, Nov 14
CHAMBERLIN, William Henry, Asia Draws Its Sword, Feb. 17
CHINA: Meng Chiang, The New Nation, Nov. 31
CHINESE Are Like That, The, Sept. 21
CHRISTMAS Books for 1939, Dec. 1
CITY Government, Sept. 19
CIVILIAN Can Take It, The, March 33
CLAPPER, Raymond, Oct. 39
COLLINS, Edward H., American Business and the War, Nov. 29
COMMONWEALTH and Southern, Wendell Willkie of the, Feb. 21
CONGRESS Passes a Bill, March 19
COUSINS, Norman, Books, Sept. 1, Oct. 1, Nov. 1, Dec. 1, Jan. 1, Feb. 1, March 1, Will Women Lose Their Jobs, Sept. 14
COVERING the Crisis, Oct. 35
CROW, Carl, The Chinese Are Like That, Sept. 21

DALADIER, Premier of France, Jan. 19
DAVIS, Shelby Cullom, Dec. 41
DEAN, Vera Micheles, Stalin in Europe, The Balkans, Nov. 15
DENNY, George V., Sept. 45, Oct. 42, Nov. 38, Dec. 44, Jan. 31, Feb. 39, March 42
DEMOCRACY on the Defensive, Jan. 31—Democracy Rules the Air Waves, Feb. 33
DEWEY, Thomas E., of New York, Jan. 35
DIES, Martin, of Texas, Dec. 29
DIMNET, Abbe Ernest, France Makes Up Her Mind, Dec. 15
DOES England Expect Us to Fight?, Dec. 18
DUFFIELD, Marcus, Hitler's Germany, Oct. 12
DUPUY, Major R. Ernest, Our New Arms Program, Jan. 33

ECONOMIC War, Oct. 25
ELY, Richard T., The War Behind the War, Oct. 25
ENGLAND: Does England Expect Us to Fight?, Dec. 18
ENTERTAINMENT, Sept. 52
EUROPE, The Future of, Jan. 13

FINANCE, Nov. 21, Feb. 18
FRANCE Goes to War, Nov. 22, **France Makes** Up Her Mind, Dec. 15; Daladier, Premier of France, Jan. 19
FRANKLIN, Jay, Congress Passes a Bill, March 19
FROM Garbage to Good Government, Sept. 19

GALLUP, Dr. George, Polling Public Opinion, Feb. 23
GANDHI Balks Again, Dec. 25
GERMAN Army & Monarchy, Feb. 27
GENERAL Electric's New Chairman, Jan. 10
GUNTHER, John, Daladier: Premier of France, Jan. 19

HAMILTON, Gordon, G. E.'s New Chairman, Jan. 10, Wendell Willkie of C & S, Feb. 21
HARD, William, Jr., From Garbage to Good Government, Sept. 19
HAWAII, March 36
HENRY, Thomas P., Mr. Motorist Speaks Out, Oct. 53
HIGH Command, The, Oct. 28
HILL, Frank Ernest, Democracy Rules the Airwaves, Feb. 33
HISTORY in the Making, Sept. 7, Oct. 6, Nov. 6, Dec. 7, Jan. 7, Feb. 6, March 10
HITLER: Hitler's Germany, Nov. 12, Can Hitler Invade America, Dec. 18
HOLLYWOOD: Hollywood Sets the Style, Nov. 35, A Londoner Looks at Hollywood, March 39
HUGHES, Rupert, Thomas E. Dewey of New York, Jan. 35
HUNGARIAN Goose Step, Sept. 29

ITALY: Is Italy Winning the War?, March 21

JACKSON, Lon, Our Billion Dollar Rock, March 36
JAPAN: The Problem of Japanese Trade, Dec. 49; The Sino-Japanese Front, Jan. 22
JOHNSON, Brig. Gen. Hugh S., Can Hitler Invade America?, Dec. 18
JOHNSON, Thomas M., As the War Begins, Oct. 30

KNEPPER, Max, Scrambled Eggs in California, Oct. 58

LATIN America and the War, Jan. 25
LONDONER Looks at Hollywood, A, March 39
LORE, Ludwig, Europe Completes a Cycle, Oct. 21

MARTIN Dies of Texas, Dec. 29
MATHESON, Walker, Meng Chiang, The New Nation, Nov. 31
MATSON, Clarence H., The Problem of Japanese Trade, Dec. 49
MENG Chiang, The New Nation, Nov. 31
MILITARY: As the War Begins, Oct. 30; Military Strategy & Tactics, Jan. 16
MILLER, James, Moses, Idealist in Action, Sept. 26
MOLOTOV, Jan. 12
MONARCHY and the German Army, Feb. 27
MOSES, Idealist in Action, Sept. 26
MR. Motorist Speaks Out, Oct. 53
MURPHY, Thomas E., Oct. 50

NATIONAL Pocket Book, The, Feb. 13
NASON, Major Leonard, Jan. 16
NAVY, The, March 30
NEVINS, Allan, The National Pocket Book, Feb. 18
N.L.R.B. on the Carpet, Feb. 30
NOTES and Documents, On Record, Oct. 15, Nov. 50, Dec. 55, Feb. 53

ON Record, Notes and Documents, Oct. 15, Nov. 50, Dec. 55, Feb. 53
OUR American Defenses, Nov. 24
OUR Billion Dollar Rock, March 36
OUR New Arms Program, Jan. 33

PEACE, Ten Points for World, **March 16**
PERSONALITIES in the War, Oct. 28
PHILIPPINES, Sept. 31
POLLING Public Opinion, Feb. 23
POLITICS: Political War, Oct. 21, American Politics in High Gear, Jan. 28
POSTAL, Bernard, The Civilian Can Take It, March 33
PRATT, Fletcher, Nov. 26
PROBLEM Child of the Pacific, Sept. 31
PROBLEM of Japanese Trade, The, Dec. 29

RADIO: Covering the Crisis, Oct. 35
RAPER, Charles L., The St. Lawrence Waterway, March 28
RED Cross and the War, The, Dec. 58
REED, Philip Dunham, Jan. 10
RHODE Island's Vanderbilt, Oct. 50
RIBBENTROP: Hitler's Oracle, Dec. 28
ROGERS, Lindsay, American Politics in High Gear, Jan 28
RUSSIA'S Molotov, Jan. 12

SCIENCE, Sept. 51
SCRAMBLED Eggs in California, Oct. 58
SHEEAN, Vincent, The Future of Europe, Jan. 13
SINO-JAPANESE Front, The, Jan. 22
SMYTH, Joseph Hilton, Hungarian Goose Step, Sept. 29
STALIN in Europe: The Balkans, Nov. 15, The Baltic, Nov. 19
STARK, Louis, N.L.R.B. on the Carpet, Feb. 30
STIRLING, Admiral Yates, March 30
ST. LAWRENCE Waterway, The, March 28
STRATEGY, Military and Tactics, Jan. 16
STRAUSZ-HUPE, Robert, France Goes to War, Nov. 22; Russia's Molotov, Jan. 12; Monarchy and the German Army, Feb. 27
SULLIVAN, Mark, A Chain of Broken Promises, Nov. 14

TACTICS, Military Strategy and, Jan. 16
TANKS Are Coming, The, Dec. 21
TAXES, Oct. 53
TEN Important Books of Non-Fiction in 1939, Jan. 1
TEN Points for World Peace, March 16
TEXAS, Martin Dies of, Dec. 29
THEY SAY, Sept. 86, Oct. 47, Nov. 43, Dec 31, Jan. 46, Feb. 44, March 47
THOMAS E. Dewey of New York, Jan. 35
TOWARD the American Dream, Dec. 41
TOWN Hall Essay Contest, Feb. 43, March 46
TRAVEL, Sept. 56, Oct. 61, Nov. 68, Feb. 61, March 61

UNCLE SAM Counts Noses, Feb. 36

VANDERBILT, Rhode Island's, Oct. 50
VAN LOON, Hendrik Willem, The War and the Arts, Jan. 42
VAUGHN, Miles, The Sino-Japanese Front, Jan. 22

WALTON, Sydney G. Travel, Oct. 61
WAR: Chronology of the War, Oct. 12, Nov. 55, Dec. 52, Jan. 55, Feb. 55, March 55; Political: Europe Completes a Cycle, Oct. 21; Economic: The War Behind the War, Oct. 25; Personalities: The High Command, Oct. 28; Military: As the War Begins, Oct. 30; Red Cross and the War, Dec. 58; Latin America and the War Jan. 25; War and the Arts, Jan. 42; Notes & Documents, Oct. 15, Nov. 50, Dec. 52, Feb. 53
WASHINGTON: America and Neutrality, Oct. 39
WELLS, H. G., Ten Points for World Peace, March 16
WHARTON, Don, The Tanks Are Coming, Dec. 21
WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? Sept. 45, Oct. 42, Nov. 38, Dec. 44, Feb. 39, March 42
WHEELER and the Liberals, March 25
WILLISON, George F., Uncle Sam Counts Noses, Feb. 36
WILLKIE, Wendell, of C&S, Feb. 21
WILL Women Lose Their Jobs? Sept. 14
WOLFE, Henry C.: Stalin in Europe: The Baltic, Nov. 19; Ribbentrop: Hitler's Oracle, Dec. 28; Is Italy Winning the War?, March 21
WOMEN, Sept. 14

OTHER BOOK-DIVIDENDS DISTRIBUTED — FREE —

TO BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH CLUB MEMBERS

— continued from other side

You are not obliged, as a member of the Club, to take the book-of-the-month its judges choose. Nor are you obliged to buy one book every month from the Club.

Publishers submit all their important books to us. These go through the most careful reading routine now in existence. At the end of this sifting process, our judges choose the book-of-the-month.

You receive a carefully written report about this book *in advance of its publication*. If you decide from this report that it is a book you really want, you let it come to you. If not, you merely sign and mail a slip, saying: "Don't want it."

You Still Browse in Bookstores

Scores of other recommendations are made to help you choose *among all new books* with discrimination. If you want to buy one of these from the Club, you can get it by merely asking for it. Or you can use these reports (we find that most of our members do) to guide you in buying these miscellaneous recommended books from your neighborhood bookseller.

In other words, instead of limiting your reading, this system widens it. You can browse among the books as always, but now do it more intelligently; you know what to look for.

"FISHERMEN THREE" by John E. Costigan, N.A., S.A.E. A reproduction of one of the etchings, greatly reduced in size.

The Many Advantages

Once and for all this system *really keeps you from missing the new books you want to read.* You do actually buy and read those you want.

In addition, there is a great money-saving *whenever you buy the book-of-the-month from the Club.* Time and again they are books you ultimately find yourself buying anyway because they are so widely talked about. *For every two books-of-the-month you decide to buy you receive, free, one of the Club's book-dividends.*

How It Can Be Done

These book-dividends really represent a unique and remarkable system of profit-sharing. The explanation is that so many of the Club's members ordinarily want the book-of-the-month that an enormous edition can be printed. The saving on this quantity-production is large enough to enable the Club to buy the right to print *other fine* library volumes. These are then manufactured and distributed free among the Club's members—*one for every two books-of-the-month you buy.* The resulting economy is extraordinary. For every $1 you spend for a book-of-the-month you actually receive about 75c back in the form of free books, figured at retail value.

What's Your Obligation

You pay no yearly sum to belong to the Book-of-the-Month Club. *You pay nothing, except for the books you buy.* You simply receive a bill with each book sent.

Your only obligation as a member is to agree to buy four books-of-the-month a year from the Club. These may be current or past selections, if the latter are in stock at the time.

FREE . . TO NEW MEMBERS

A TREASURY OF AMERICAN PRINTS

Containing One Hundred Reproductions *of Selected Etchings and Lithographs* by America's Foremost Artists

— or any of the other book-dividends listed in postcard

If you decide to join the Book-of-the-Month Club now, we will give you free, as a new member, this unusual volume. (Retail price: $3.95). These reproductions are indistinguishable from the original prints—which sold for as high as from $5 to $25 each. Any specially-loved ones may be taken out of the book and framed, without damage to binding. *A Treasury of American Prints* was one of the recent book-dividends of the Club. Or, if you prefer, you may choose any past book-dividend which we still have on hand.

Please enroll me as a member. It is understood that I am to receive a free copy of A TREASURY OF AMERICAN PRINTS, that I am also to receive, without expense, your monthly magazine which reports about current books, and that for every two books-of-the-month I purchase from the Club, I am to receive the current book-dividend then being distributed. For my part, I agree to purchase at least four books-of-the-month a year from the Club.

IMPORTANT: Please check whether you would like us to ship the current book-of-the-month with the free book above **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐

Name Mr / Mrs / Miss } ....
PLEASE PRINT PLAINLY

Address ....

City .... *State*...............

Business Connections, if any

If you do not wish **A TREASURY OF AMERICAN PRINTS** ***as your free enrollment book check box below for title you prefer. (No others available at this time.)***

☐ **TELLERS OF TALES** ☐ **BARTLETT'S QUOTATIONS** ☐ **JOSEPH IN EGYPT**
☐ **INSIDE EUROPE** ☐ **ANDREW JACKSON** ☐ **MADAME CURIE**

Books shipped to Canadian members, DUTY PAID, through Book-of-the-Month Club (Canada) Ltd.

He is always saying apologetically:

"I just can't find any time to read books!"

Yet . . . **IF HE SPENT (ON AN AVERAGE) ONLY 30 MINUTES A DAY—BEFORE BEDTIME, OR WHILE TRAVELLING TO OR FROM WORK, OR IN OTHER LEISURE MOMENTS—HE COULD EASILY READ EVERY BEST-SELLER DURING THE YEAR, AND A GREAT DEAL MORE!**

EVEN if you read slowly, an average of *only half an hour a day* would have enabled you to read, within the past few months, every one of the following widely-discussed new books:

ESCAPE *by Ethel Vance*
KITTY FOYLE *by Christopher Morley*
THE NAZARENE *by Sholem Asch*
MOMENT IN PEKING *by Lin Yutang*
THE GRAPES OF WRATH *by John Steinbeck*
THE YEARLING *by Marjorie K. Rawlings*
THE REVOLUTION OF NIHILISM *by Hermann Rauschning*
COUNTRY LAWYER *by Bellamy Partridge*
INSIDE ASIA *by John Gunther*
NOT PEACE BUT A SWORD *by Vincent Sheean*
WIND, SAND AND STARS *by Antoine de Saint Exupéry*
DAYS OF OUR YEARS *by Pierre van Paassen*

—or *any other* new books you may have been particularly anxious to read.

What To Do About It

Over 250,000 book-reading families—persons like yourself—have found a subscription to the Book-of-the-Month Club by far the most effectual way to keep themselves from missing the new books they are really interested in.

It is an interesting fact, for example, that of the dozen national best-sellers listed above seven were Book-of-the-Month Club choices.

—continued on other side

c Marcosson Marquis Childs S. Strausz-Hupé

e. Chiang Kai-Shek A. L. Sacher Philip Jessup 25¢

CURRENT HISTORY

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF THE AIR

Dr. William C. Bagley

THE DYKES OF HOLLAND YELLOW PERIL: GOLD

MEXICAN CABALLERO SAVING THE SOIL

George V. Denny, Jr.—Presidential Poll of Newspaper Editors

Big enough for the job

We live in a big country and it takes a big telephone company to give good service to millions of people. The Bell System is doing its part in providing for the nation's telephone needs, whatever they may be.

But the Bell System aims to be big in more ways than mere size. It aims to be big in the conduct of its business, in its relations with employees and its plans for the future. All of this helps to give the nation quick, dependable, courteous telephone service at low cost.

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The World Today in Books

NORMAN COUSINS

NOWHERE in the world of books is the mortality rate higher than in the field of world affairs. In an age where the unpredictable is the commonplace, books fall before the scythe of changing events almost as quickly as they are born. It is a rare author of a book on history-in-the-making who can submit a manuscript to publishers today and enjoy the assurance that what he has to say may not be completely out-dated tomorrow.

That is why those books on world affairs which do manage to stand up under the pressure of the times are of particular value. One such book is H. B. Elliston's *Finland Fights* (Little, Brown, $2.75), which retains its importance and value even though the war with the Russian invader has come to an end. Elliston sees the Finnish situation as part of a larger conflict; he realizes that Scandinavia may have provided—and may still provide—the locale for the merging of Europe's wars into the most costly battle in all history. He views Finland not as an isolated entity but as an integral part of the broader European scene, highlighting her ties to and her relationships with other nations, and explaining their significance.

One result of a Finnish defeat, says Elliston—and this takes on added meaning in view of the severity of the "peace" terms imposed by Russia, which many observers say is tantamount to defeat—might be a threat to the independence of the other Scandinavian nations. Stalin's primary motive in attacking Finland, he points out, was to seal up the Gulf of Finland as a defensive measure against what the Soviet conceives to be the passage-way for a drive by other nations against her borders. But it seems clear from this book that Stalin, having humbled Finland, might find it expedient to attempt possession of the Norwegian outlet to the Atlantic at Narvik and thus realize the old imperialistic ambition of Czarist Russia. The Soviet would then be strategically situated in relation to Sweden's Lapland iron ore mines, which she would probably attempt to close. "No Scandinavian," he adds, "can ignore the possibility of the Russians dragging the entire peninsula into war directly."

Although Elliston's book was written at least two months before its actual publication, and thus had no way of foreseeing the precise complexion of the end of the war (ironically, it was issued just about the time the "peace" talks began), it seems clear here that he does not believe any cessation of hostilities between Russia and Finland would automatically remove the threat to Scandinavia.

Elliston believes that responsibility not only for the Finnish tragedy but for the entire European debacle belongs to a new "King" ruling the Continent today—a "King of Fear" who is taking hope away from Europe, particularly in Scandinavia, "depriving their governments of constructive policies, eating into what remains of the civilization of Europe, and reducing its society to a madhouse. Everybody seems to be waiting for a *deus ex machina*, preferably Uncle Sam." Elliston is convinced America must share the responsibility for what has happened during the last few years. Some day, he says, we shall have to lend our hand to putting all the pieces together again.

The author is Financial Editor of *The Christian Science Monitor* and one of its foreign correspondents. He arrived in Finland shortly before the outbreak of the war, for the purpose of rounding out material for a general book he was writing on Scandinavia. As it turned out, his arrival in Helsinki coincided almost exactly with that of Russian bombs on the first day of war. This book is a story not only of the war days which fol-

"My! How Handy!"

"A pump right in the kitchen! What'll they think of next? You're a lucky woman, Josephine."

LUCKY? Yes—compared with toting heavy pails of water from an outside well. But if Josephine was lucky, what about her granddaughter of today, with her modern electrified kitchen?

With electric lights, Josephine's granddaughter doesn't have to fill and clean lamps. With her electric refrigerator, she doesn't have to keep the butter in the cellar in warm weather, or worry whether the milk will spoil. Her electric cleaner makes it unnecessary to tear up the carpets every spring and lug them out and beat them. With her electric range, she doesn't have to cook over a hot stove. And the furnace keeps the house at the right temperature without her going near the cellar.

Even if electricity's contributions to better living had stopped here, we'd still recognize it as one of the greatest benefits of our century. But electricity goes much further. In every branch of industry it helps to make manufactured articles available at such low prices and in such quantity and variety that more millions of people can enjoy them.

For more than 60 years General Electric scientists, engineers, and workmen have been seeking for ways to make electricity more useful to all of us. Their success is measured by the creation of More Goods for More People at Less Cost.

G-E research and engineering have saved the public from ten to one hundred dollars for every dollar they have earned for General Electric

lowed but of the entire Scandinavian scene. It contains the raw meat of history to which historians will turn for many years to come.

It is evident from his writing that the Russian invasion made a tremendous impact upon Elliston. Up to the actual time of the first bombing, he is the detached, dispassionate reporter explaining the nature of things in Scandinavia. But when death dropped from the sky he became deeply stirred—stirred not only by the horror and barbarism of unprovoked attack but by the stolidity and quiet heroism of the Finnish people. Here he becomes more than a mere reporter; his description of the bombing reflects what must have been a profound emotional shock, and he writes with force and great feeling:

"I looked out of my window. Finnish citizens were hurrying to bomb shelters. It was a perfect winter morning, with the sun shining out of a blue sky, unflecked save for one cotton woolly ball of cloud. Inside that cloud were the Russian planes . . . . with its destructive freight this solitary cloud moved across the heavens like a Spanish galleon in full sail . . . . Storm over Europe! What on earth had Stalin started in that part of the world which on the basis of a century and a quarter of peace had been working out a system of social democracy?"

As though in answer to those who might regard his book as an obituary for Finland—in view of the way in which the war ended—Elliston is certain that Finland can never be crushed. "Whatever may happen, this much may be said—that no Finnish Kosciusko will ever be able to say, as he lies dying on the battlefield, 'Finis Finland.' Finland is part of the promise of the next Europe at the end of all the present travail, no matter what happens."

April **CURRENT HISTORY** 1940

Contents

GENERAL ARTICLES

The Reality of International Law . . . . *Philip C. Jessup* 13

Sweden: Her Tragic Dilemma . . . . . *Marquis W. Childs* 16

Holland Looks to Her Dikes . *Cornelius Vanderbreggen, Jr.* 19

Great Britain's Ironside . . . . . . *Robert Strausz-Hupé* 21

B'nai B'rith . . . . *Dr. Abram L. Sacher* 24

Yellow Peril . . . . *S. F. Porter* 28

China Unbowed . . . . *Mme. Chiang Kai-shek* 31

The Conquest of Cancer . . . . *Issac F. Marcosson* 33

Almazan, Mexican Caballero . . . . *Michael Scully* 37

The American School of the Air . . . *Dr. William C. Bagley* 40

Saving the Soil . . . . *R. H. Musser* 43

HISTORY IN THE MAKING 6

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? 46

THEY SAY 49

CHRONOLOGY 58

BOOKS . . . . *Norman Cousins* 1

COVER PHOTOGRAPHY—BRITISH COMBINE PHOTOS, LTD.

• • •

Editors: JOHN T. HACKETT, E. TREVOR HILL

Associate Editor: ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE

Advertising Manager: JOHN A. CURTIS

Circulation Manager: FRED ROSEN

Editorial Assistants: ROGER STRAUS, JR., LOIS HALL, NATHALIE OSBORN

Current History, Volume LI, No. 8, April, 1940 Whole No 304 Published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation, Publication office, 29 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass.; New York office, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N Y E Trevor Hill, President; John T Hackett, Vice-President; Anne Roane, Secretary; I Harvey Williams, Treasurer John A. Curtis, Advertising Manager 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Central and South America and Spain; Canada 50c a year additional; elsewhere $1.25 a year additional Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance. Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned. Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1939, at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879 Entered in Canada as second-class matter Copyright, 1940, by C-H Publishing Corporation Printed in U. S. A.

MEMORANDUM FOR LIBRARIANS:

CURRENT HISTORY indexes are published in the last number of each volume.
Beginning with the present volume, 51, every volume will have twelve numbers and will run from September through August. The complete index for the volume will be in the August issue.

Ernest Sutherland Bates, or "Bracky," as he was known to his friends, was a small, quiet, modest man—perhaps one of the most important yet underrated literary figures of his day. True, he won wide recognition for his editing and arrangement of *The Bible: Designed to Be Read as Living Literature*, but even here not enough credit was given him for his abilities as an historian and student of original research. He had a versatility, or rather a universality, which perhaps prevented him from becoming identified as an outstanding specialist in any single field. Actually, he was a specialist in many fields—history, biography, theology, economics. And as his books survive with the years his name will take on its proper importance.

Just a few days after he finished his last book, Ernest Sutherland Bates died. But the book, which he calls *American Faith* (Norton, $3.75), is an inspiring testament to his multiple abilities. It digs down into the root of America's past—religious, political, and economic—for definitive evidence of the beginnings and emergence of American faith, which in essence he finds is synonymous with our belief in democratic institutions. Democracy, he says, is in many respects an outgrowth of religious views. For example, the Pilgrims exemplified and furthered local self-government; the Baptists the separation of Church from state; the Quakers equality and the followers of Roger Williams and William Penn free speech.

In an introduction, he pleads for the allegiance of men to democratic faith. It demands, he says, not half-men but whole men. The whole man, he adds, is the moral man, "concerned everywhere with values, a field too often pre-empted by religion: for politics, also, is a realm of values, government in theory, though rarely in practice, by an ideal of the 'best government'; so, too, is economics, for few would deny that a better economic organization than that which we have surely can and surely must be found." Bates saw the religious influences only as part of broader forces working upon the creation and extension of democratic concepts.

American Faith goes all the way back to the Reformation for its beginnings. It was then that there was a growth of individual self-consciousness, which, when transplanted to America, was able to develop into self-expression and even application. In America, democratic equality became actuality.

From these beginnings in America Bates records and evaluates the development of the "American faith" up through the Civil War, where liberalism and democracy, which he calls the main articles of American faith, were put to their severest test. This is as far as the book goes; it is a question whether the author's untimely death several months ago cut short his work on it, but even as it stands it is complete. Though additional material on the pragmatic evidence of American faith since the World War undoubtedly would have enhanced the book's value, especially for our times, the work does perform an important function in exploring the origins and development of American faith from its beginning.

American Faith is easily one of the most notable books of the year. It bears the evidence, as do Bates' earlier works, of immense research and extraordinary synthesis. One might call it a profound book, except that such a description might make it seem specialized and uninteresting, which, of course, it is not.

EUGENE LYONS is one of a number of former partisans who once viewed the Soviet experiment with great fervor and lofty hopes. For six years he served the United Press in Russia, and it is widely conceded (aside from New York's Union Square) that he did a thoroughly good job of it.

In Stalin: Czar of All the Russias (Lippencott $2.50) Lyons runs the gamut of forensics as only a disillusioned left-sympathizer can. He considers Stalin—or Yossif Vissarionovich Djugashvilli, as the dictator was formerly known—as a super-Asiatic despot. Stalin's long memory and love of vengeance are certainly Asiatic, it would seem; although certain Republicans, alas, attribute just these same qualities to Franklin D. Roosevelt, a Nordic from way back.

Lyons sees Stalin as "a dark-visaged, pock-marked, slow-moving Asiatic" out of "the slums of a fourth-rate Caucasian town . . . . sprung from an offal-heap of feuding races and clashing superstitions." And Mr. Lyons, after six long Moscow years, ought to know. On the other hand, one of the defeated Finnish delegates described Mr. Djugashvilli as a rather comfortable and humorous average man—this after many tortured hours at the conference table. Lyons admits that Stalin is a "triumph of mediocrity."

Just as the first modern dictator, Bonaparte, overcame the idealized chaos of the French revolution and turned it to his own imperial purposes, so has Czar Stalin damned the Bolshevik flood into his own "royal" stream of history. Napoleon and Stalin stand guilty of betraying, respectively, 1789 and 1917.

As for the government of the Soviet Union, it used to be a Bolshevik party matter. The party consisted of three or four million members, men and women, who employed the democratic method *within* their own ranks and councils, with compåratively free party elections and free party discussions. But today even that limited democracy, says Lyons, has vanished. Russia now has one dictator instead of a ruling minority of three or four million people—tyranny instead of oligarchy.

Lyons believes that Stalin is a wolf in sheep's clothing; or a sheep in wolf's clothing, depending upon the point of view. Stalin continues to use the old revolutionary slogans and the radical machinery of the Third International whenever convenient, but in reality he is running a counter-revolution behind red camouflage. Lyons points out that Stalin does not like "Frenchified Internationalists"—and in this, not a few of our own GOP members and Dixie Democrats would agree with him.

Lyons' book is good, even though he is full of indignation. Soviet Russia has changed face since 1927 and Eugene Lyons is just the man to ring the changes. His is a vivid picture of the man who created the new anti-soviet Soviets.

A NAVY SECOND TO NONE, by George Davis (Harcourt, Brace, $3.75) is an excellent book, bulky and scholarly, yet readable. Its theme, or underlying theme, is its concluding sentence:

"Let us not squander the wealth of our people upon needless armament which may jeopardize the stability of our institutions or tempt us to pursue the will-o'-the-wisp of economic ambitions or power politics in distant parts of the world."

Mr. Davis, a research expert on international studies and a dread College Entrance Board examiner, opens his book with the rise and decline of the early American Navy: the frigates and sloops and "pocket-battleships" of 1812. In the latter year, for example, we pitted *seventeen* ships against John Bull's cool thousand; *450* Yankee naval guns fired confidently at 28,000 Limey ones. But after the Civil War, American interest in the navy flagged. It began to revive before that most delightful of all imperialist ventures—the Spanish war.

From coast defenders and commerce destroyers (privateers) we progressed to the lordship of the Caribbean (corresponding to Uncle Ivan's Baltic, or Uncle Benito's Marc Nostrum). Admiral Mahan—beloved by Roosevelts I and II—built up his extensive school of disciples, and his well-documented theory of the influence of seapower on history. Next came an American navy of second rank, out-distanced only by England and Germany. So it was in 1914.

Mr. Davis discusses "Wilson's Armada", and then takes up post-war "blue-print battles" and hull-scrappings. Then comes our equality with the English, via the Washington Conference of 1921. Uncle Sam was admitted to the joint-rulership of the waves by his island cousins. Later, the naval race was resumed with a vengeance—even the defeated Germans appearing on the rebound, money or no money, peace treaty notwithstanding.

At this point Davis goes into Retrospect and Prospect—and his mid-road common sense asserts itself. He is no pacifist. But there are sane limits. Which, in a not so vicious circle, takes us back to our opening, and his closing, words of wisdom. His is a worthwhile study.

CURRENT HISTORY VOL. LI, No. 8, April 1940

Mr. Welles Returns

When Sumner Welles, American Under-Secretary of State, stepped ashore in Naples on February 26, he carried a White House commission to learn all he could about chances for peace in war-ravaged Europe. When he sailed for home on March 20, he had just seen Count Ciano following Mussolini's momentous meeting with Hitler at the little Italian town of Brennero and his head was crammed with information. While he was abroad, he had seen one of Europe's two wars—the Russo-Finnish—come to an abrupt end. Talk of peace in the Allied-German conflict was in the air, but also talk of a grave intensification of hostilities.

Mr. Welles knew better than almost any other man in the world the amount of shadow and substance in such talk. For three weeks he had been on the European circuit. He had seen two kings—Britain's George VI and Italy's Victor Emmanuel III—and had had an audience with Pope Pius. He had talked with two dictators — Mussolini and Hitler — and with the Foreign Ministers of Italy, Germany, Britain and France. Prime Minister Chamberlain and Premier Daladier had conferred with him. So had Field Marshal Goering and many lesser statesmen.

What was said to the Under-Secretary remained an official secret—he was reporting regularly in code to President Roosevelt—and Mr. Welles quickly showed himself to be a master of reticence. To inquiring newsmen he had nothing to give, except generalities, nor had those statesmen who received him. Observers failed even to obtain hints from the Welles facial expression. He preserved what some one called a "diplomatic dead-pan."

The general atmosphere of mystery that enveloped the Welles mission did not clear before the Under-Secretary left Italy for home. Had he been sent to Europe's capitals on a fact-finding tour that might lead to definite peace proposals from Washington? Or was the mission more domestic in character; in short, was it related to a possible third term? A good many in Washington placed their bets on this latter interpretation, arguing that Mr. Roosevelt would seek re-election in the fall if, on the basis of the Welles reports, he concluded that Europe would see no peace this year, but would see instead the "war in earnest" so long predicted and delayed. In a period of European "Blitzkrieg," there would be a demand for an experienced pilot on the American bridge. Would that pilot's initials be F. D. R.?

Politics Astir

In Chicago next July Democrats, in convention assembled, will pick a Presidential nominee in the same hall where eight years ago they selected Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Will history repeat itself, even if in so doing it breaks the historic ban upon a third term? The President kept his own counsel, but the question arose: "If not Roosevelt, who?"

Sumner Welles

Vice-President Garner's hat is in the Democratic ring, but his age is widely considered a handicap; if nominated and elected, he would be seventy-one by inauguration day. Postmaster General Farley has been regarded as receptive. So have Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana and Senator Bennett Champ Clark of Missouri. Social Security Administrator McNutt has said he would like the job. But except for Mr. Garner, all the others have waited for word from the White House.

No word has been forthcoming. Many observers have felt that Mr. Roosevelt was waiting for two things: (1) The Welles report on Europe; (2) evidence that a third term would be possible. On this second point, if such a point there was, returns in the early Presidential primaries had to be awaited.

Only the New Hampshire primary has been held to date, and its returns are probably not so indicative as those from the Wisconsin, Illinois and Nebraska primaries will be this April. But New Hampshire did approve delegates pledged to Roosevelt, while passing over delegates pledged to Garner and Farley. The vote was small, and political experts concluded that, while the New Hampshire primaries proved Mr. Roosevelt could be renominated, they did not prove he could—or could not—be re-elected.

Republicans, as interested as the Democrats in this third-term business, might alter their choice of a standard-bearer if they knew he had to run against Mr. Roosevelt. Lacking

that knowledge, they have been seeking to learn from the primaries which of their hopefuls is the strongest.

New York's District Attorney Dewey and Ohio's Senator Taft have been most active in the quest for delegates. Senator Vandenberg of Michigan still looks like a good bet to many political wise men. In the New Hampshire primaries Republican readers of the political entrails found no guidance. Republican delegates were unpledged, but were expected to vote for the State's "favorite son," Senator Styles Bridges. So Republicans seeking enlightenment looked ahead to the Wisconsin primary on April 2, with its clean-cut race for delegates between Mr. Dewey and Mr. Vandenberg.

Holland, The Nashville Banner

A Spring Offensive

Mickey Preferred

An international figure is Mickey Mouse of Hollywood, now aged twelve, and while he has had trouble with foreign authorities sometimes because he seemed to them "bourgeois" or—even more strangely—"subversive," he and his friend Minnie have won enthusiastic friends the world around. Mickey takes both children and sophisticated adults into a land of make-believe whose problems all end happily. His has been a great success story.

Mickey's success has also been the success of his creator, thirty-eight-year-old Walter E. Disney. Besides Mickey, there have been many other Disney favorites: the three little pigs, Snow White and the dwarfs, Donald Duck, Pinocchio. In their various forms, they have made Walt Disney rich. Last year his personal earnings were $133,903, while the net income of his firm, Disney Productions, was more than a million dollars.

Fame has come to Disney, as well as wealth. He is not a college graduate, but he has been awarded honorary degrees from institutions like Harvard. A water-color of his hangs in New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art.

A few weeks ago, Disney Productions decided to raise new capital and to expand by offering 150,000 shares of preferred stock to the public. A registration statement was filed with the S.E.C. Editorially *The New York Times* commented: "It will seem a little odd to run one's finger down the columns on the financial page some day and see Mickey, Inc. (or Walt Disney Productions, if one insists on being formal) going up or down like a thermometer."

Hatch Act

Alben W. Barkley is a Senator from Kentucky and the majority leader in the Upper House. Recently the vagaries of political life have put him in an ironical position.

"Dear Alben," as President Roosevelt once called him in a letter later published, ran for re-election in 1938. It was a hard campaign, even though the President openly supported the Senator, and before the votes were counted it was charged that W.P.A. administrators had rounded up support for Mr. Barkley. These charges echoed on Capitol Hill in Washington, leading, after the report of a Senate investigating committee, to passage of the Hatch Act.

This law banned political activity on the part of 270,000 federal employees below the rank of policy-making officials. Such workers are now protected from party assessments. They cannot make political speeches, solicit votes, or run for office. They can march in, but must not lead parades. Though the law was regarded at the time as an anti-Roosevelt maneuver to limit the New Deal's power in the 1940 elections, President Roosevelt gave his approval.

In the present Congressional session Senator Hatch has sought to extend the workings of his law by placing under its jurisdiction all state workers whose salaries are paid in whole or part from federal funds. Such a proposal, threatening the very foundations of many state Democratic machines, loosed a Senate free-for-all.

The Administration gave the revised law its blessing, thus forcing Senator Barkley as majority leader to favor the change. Republicans supported him. Many New Dealers op-

posed. Debate cut across liberal and conservative lines on the Democratic side. Filibuster sometimes threatened. But Senator Barkley, who might not be in the chamber at all had the original Hatch Act been passed in 1937 instead of 1939, stood fast. In the end the Senate approved the amendments, passing the ticklish political problem on to the House.

Wagner Act

Behind a mahogany desk in the United States Senate chamber, Robert F. Wagner has been representing New York since 1927, a period long enough to give him a national name. He lacked a few months of being fifty when, a Democrat, he took his Senate seat. In New York, he had been an Assemblyman, a State Senator, Lieutenant Governor, a judge on the State Supreme Court. Then he went to Washington and the New Deal gave him his national chance.

In rapid succession after March 1933 this New Yorker—he was born in Germany—dropped into the hopper bills that became law, among them bills creating the Railway Pensions Act, the N.R.A. and the Social Security Act. He also fathered the United States Housing Act and, most controversial of all, the National Labor Relations Act that popularly bears his name.

With a jealous eye the Senator has watched over the National Labor Relations Act, though it has been a troublesome child. Organized labor's two camps have attacked the law, accusing its administrative board, the N.L.R.B., of favoring one as against the other. Employers have charged that the law was weighted in favor of employees. A special House committee, headed by Representative Howard W. Smith, recently investigated the board and uncovered alleged administrative abuses. Last month the committee brought in a majority report that would drastically rewrite the Wagner Act.

Senator Wagner quickly girded for the fray. He charged that the committee would so alter the law as to nullify labor's present guarantees of collective bargaining through representatives of its own choosing. So far-reaching were the committee's proposals, he argued, that the law would become "a delusive remedy for the worker and a concrete weapon for the oppression of labor."

Senator Wagner was not alone in opposing the proposed changes. The White House has not been thought friendly to tampering with the National Labor Relations Act. The House Labor Committee has sought to stave off amendments. Organized labor, sinking its differences, has denounced the Smith committee's recommendations. But in the House, it was believed, there were enough supporters of Wagner Act revision to bring passage of the changes during the present session. Then, according to Washington wiseacres, the changes would be allowed to die in the Senate while the Wagner Act was fought out this summer and fall in the presidential campaign.

Idle Queens of the Sea

On New York's Twelfth Avenue, opposite the docks where great liners tie up in peacetime, is the Anchor Café, a resort for sailormen and for New Yorkers searching for atmosphere. When the big liners came, there used to be gay nights at the Anchor, and until Europe's war broke out the interlude between the departure of one liner and the arrival of another was always brief.

Since last September the Anchor has known slim times. The German ships disappeared; no longer were there guttural "prosits" at the bar. The Bermuda boats, whose shrill whistles once made clerks restless in nearby offices, were off to the war. British and French liners sailed for home, only a few returning, slipping into port unannounced and dowdy in wartime gray, the camouflage color of 1940.

Robert F. Wagner

Two great liners, Allied, remained: the *Queen Mary* and the *Normandie*. Substantial and British-looking, the *Queen Mary* put on gray but then settled down in New York, apparently to wait for peace. Alongside, her rival, the great *Normandie*, with her rakish lines, lay idle. On both, skeleton crews kept things ship-shape. A few weeks ago, the two queens of the sea were joined by another, even bigger than they. The 85,000-ton *Queen Elizabeth* arrived unannounced from the Scottish shipyard where she had been building when war came. She was not wholly finished. She was painted gray. A stranger maiden voyage no modern ship has ever had, but she had found refuge from possible enemy bombers.

Then, on March 18, several hundred British seamen landed in New York after a secret voyage and boarded the *Queen Mary*. On the same day, painters began to give her another coat of gray. Along the waterfront ran the rumor that the *Queen Mary* and the *Mauretania* would soon be used to transport troops. Rumor became fact when both ships went to sea within 48 hours.

Russo-Finnish Peace

On March 13, exactly 105 days after the Red army marched into Finland, peace came to northern Europe. The Soviet invasion started on November 30, 1939, after weeks of negotiations in which Moscow insisted that Finnish fortifications twenty miles from Leningrad "threatened" mighty Russia.

Toward the end of November, Moscow charged that Finnish artillery had fired on Russian border troops. and demanded that Finnish forces withdraw twelve miles from the frontier. When Finland refused, the Soviet press and radio launched a vicious campaign against Finnish Premier Cajander and called upon the Finnish people to overthrow their government. On November 28, Moscow denounced her non-aggression pact with Helsinki, and two days later, at 9:15 A.M., troops of the Red army marched against their tiny neighbor.

The crux of the Russo-Finnish dispute was Helsinki's stubborn refusal to demilitarize the Karelian Isthmus, lease to Russia a small section of Finnish territory near the mouth of the Gulf of Finland, exchange a comparatively small Karelian strip north

of Leningrad for a section of Soviet Karelia, and give up parts of the Arctic Petsamo area. Finland felt that these concessions would gravely jeopardize her national independence, and most of the neutral world agreed.

On December 1, Moscow announced the formation of a "People's Republic," headed by Otto Kuusinen, in the insignificant village of Terijoki, just within the Finnish frontier. Kuusinen, an exiled Finnish Communist, had been a resident of Moscow since the outlawing of the Communist party in Finland in 1930–31. Meanwhile, as Russian bombers rained death on Helsinki, Premier Cajander resigned and a new Finnish government under Risto Ryti was set up in the hope of securing an armistice. But all peace pleas from Ryti failed.

Norway and Sweden, stunned by the Soviet invasion of their neighbor, remained officially neutral while the Finnish defenders held off invading Red forces. In early December the League of Nations met at Geneva and asked Russia to settle her dispute with Finland by peaceful means. When she refused, the League condemned her as an aggressor and dropped her from membership.

While it lasted, the Russo-Finnish war was one of the bloodiest of modern times. The sympathy of most of the world was on the side of Finland, and she received some outside help in the form of goods, money and munitions. However, as Premier Ryti pointed out on March 15, when the Finnish Diet ratified the heart-breaking peace pact, the Finns "received no help in the form of man power in actual fact, merely a few reinforced battalions, mostly from Sweden."

Against Russia, with a population of 180,000,000, Finland was obliged to send a gallant but pitifully small army recruited from her 4,000,000 people. The weather, however, the coldest in Europe in decades, hampered the invaders. Temperatures as low as 40 degrees below zero aided the Finns to trap and destroy the 44th and 163rd Russian army divisions early in January when they sought to cut across Finland's narrow "waist." Reports from that battlefield of frozen soldiers sent shudders around the world. By the end of January the Finns reported halting a Russian attempt to flank the Mannerheim Line, and toward the end of February they wiped out still another Soviet division, killing or capturing 18,000 men.

Walker, The South Wales Echo

Be fair! I tried to get the landlord to let me in!

But by this time Moscow had moved in her crack troops, and by the beginning of March, Russian successes began to mount. Through sheer weight of numbers, the Russians pushed on. Finland knew she was doomed when part of Viborg in the southeast, an anchor of the Mannerheim Line, was captured and the fortress of Koivisto occupied.

Urgently the Finns appealed to Sweden for assistance. But Sweden refused to endanger her neutrality, fearing an invasion of all Scandinavia by Germany, Russia's ally. A last-minute offer of help came from Britain and France, but the Finns decided that it could not arrive in time and that if they accepted it they would be drawn into the larger European war.

A Finnish delegation, therefore, left Helsinki for Moscow on March 6 to discuss peace proposals which had been submitted by Russia through Sweden. Agreement was reached within a week, and at 11:00 A.M. on March 13 the guns in the Russo-Finnish war were silenced.

"But What a Peace!"

Soviet Russia's peace terms were severe, putting Finland in a strategic straitjacket. Moscow called the treaty "a splendid contribution to world peace," but by its terms the Soviet was left astride the eastern Baltic, with the fortifications of the Mannerheim Line in Russian hands, the strategic base of Hangoe poised like a dagger at the heart of Finland and at the coast of Sweden, the harbor of Petsamo under Russian domination, and with permission secured to construct a railroad from Russia across northern Finland to Sweden.

Stockholm wonders whether the Russian general staff dictated the peace provisions with the idea of a future invasion in mind. If the Reds ever decide to strike into Scandinavia again, they can strike with fearful

We Are Too Small

Excerpts from Foreign Minister Vaino Tanner's statements on the Finnish-Russian peace on March 13 and March 15.

Finland was drawn into war through no fault of her own. Territorial demands were presented to her and she was prepared to satisfy these demands to a reasonable extent. This notwithstanding, the negotiations broke down . . . . and the country was compelled to defend itself.

Despite almost daily aerial bombardments, the spirit of the home front has remained magnificently confident.

We are a small nation and can set against the enemy only a fraction of the forces which have been set rolling against us. Because of this the same men have had to remain under fire the whole time. And even the pluckiest troops gradually become weary.

Gaps, too, are always caused in the ranks in war. Thus we were in sore need of reinforcements. But these have not been forthcoming. A number of volunteers have hastened to our aid but their number, compared to the assistance needed, has been very small.

We have continued to send out appeals for help to overcome this deficiency. Our neighbors, the Scandinavian States, for whom it would have been easiest for geographical reasons to send troops to our aid, have not regarded themselves as being in a position to do so.

The Western Allies, after hesitating for some time in the beginning, announced their willingness to send to this country a fully equipped expeditionary force if this country so requests.

This promise has been frequently repeated during the past weeks. On the latest occasion the Prime Ministers of both countries, Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier, have given public assurances that their respective nations are ready, immediately on request to that effect by Finland, to stand by our side in the struggle with the aggressor.

Our military command has carefully studied this scheme for our assistance. . . . It contains one weak point. How are these reinforcements to reach this country? The geographical situation of Finland places difficulties in the way. So long as the Baltic Sea is closed, that sea route is out of the question. The route to Petsamo is long and difficult, and it is, further, held by the enemy.

The only possible route lies across the Scandinavian countries, through Norway and Sweden. The governments of these two countries have been approached by the Finnish Government on several occasions with a request for permission for Allied auxiliary forces to pass through their territory. A similar request has been made by the governments of the Allies. This permission, however, has been categorically refused on behalf of both countries concerned.

All that can be said against us is that as a nation we are too small. In spite of the great success of our defense, we cannot alone carry this struggle to a victorious end.

As no help is forthcoming, the outcome of the struggle is plain. If war continues, this country is in danger of being conquered and its population of being placed in a hopeless position.

When this eventuality became plain we began to explore the possibilities of peace.

During the negotiations. . . . in Moscow delegates of the Soviet Union presented their terms for peace. These terms are unexpectedly severe compared with what the enemy has so far succeeded in achieving by war. They also greatly exceed the demands presented by the Soviet Government last Autumn in the name of the increased security of Leningrad.

In spite of the severity of the terms the government has regarded assent to them as being in the national interest. As we have no hope of securing better terms by continuing the war, it has been preferred to agree to the present terms rather than continue a hopeless war.

Our eastern frontier will run approximately where it was fixed . . . . in 1721. Cape Hangoe will be ceded. Similarly our territory on the Rybachi peninsula in Petsamo.

The Soviet Union does not intend to interfere in either our domestic or our foreign policy. That would, indeed, have been a demand which we could not have accepted.

The Kuusinen "government," to which the future fate of this country was to have been entrusted, according to the scheme drawn up at the beginning of the war, has been thrust aside.

Countless people are now engaged in transporting the essential belongings of 450,000 people from the areas which we have to surrender. For the same number of people we have to find a livelihood, a place where they can feel at home and sheltered.

The only consolation for those who lost everything is the knowledge that they still belong to the same nation as their brother Finns.

effect from the military bases they now control in Finland.

But that Finland had no other choice than to accept these peace terms was made clear by Foreign Minister Tanner, who told the Finnish people that they had lost the war only because they were "too small a nation," and could not do otherwise but surrender to a "dictator state." Helsinki was a city of mourning and flags flew at half-mast when the Foreign Minister informed his countrymen over the radio that the war was over and that Finland was at peace. "But," he sighed, his eyes wet with tears, "what a peace!"

As the guns ceased roaring, Baron Mannerheim, Commander-in-Chief of the Finnish forces, saluted his soldiers in a classic farewell address. Thanking his army, and declaring that Finland's 15,000 dead had made Russia pay dearly with 200,000 lives, Mannerheim declared: "You did not want war. You love peace, work and progress; but you were forced into a struggle in which you have done great deeds, deeds that will shine for centuries in the pages of history . . . But you have also dealt hard blows, and if 200,000 of our enemies now lie on the snowdrifts, gazing with broken eyes at our sky, the fault is not yours. You did not hate them or wish them evil; you merely followed the stern rule of war: kill or be killed. Soldiers! I have fought on many battlefields, but never have I seen your like as warriors."

Peace Blow to Allies

Conclusion of the Russo-Finnish war was seen as a definite blow to the prestige and influence of the Allies everywhere. In France it resulted in the downfall of the Daladier cabinet which had lasted almost two years.

Worse, from the Allied point of view, the Finnish peace was a real victory for Germany on the diplomatic front. A swift development following the end of the Finnish war was the report that Russia, at the request of Germany, would offer to guarantee that Rumania would remain unmolested, no matter what happens in the Balkans. When war broke out last September, the Allies adopted the role of Rumania's protectors, and on the strength of their protective pledge had been able to keep down the amount of wheat and oil which Rumania sells to Germany.

Now Germany pressed for the job of guaranteeing Rumania's security, seeking means of keeping open the route whereby Russian oil and wheat from across the Black Sea move up the Danube to Germany.

Charging that Britain and France misled the Czechs, the Poles and now the Finns "through empty promises of aid," the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, organ of Chancellor Hitler, on March 15 advised small countries, in their own interests, to ponder the difference between the harsh Russian-Finnish peace terms and the Soviet's original demands upon Finland—a warning made to all the small states which the Allies are seeking to bring into their orbit.

The peace in Finland also raised a question regarding the Far East. Would it mean renewal of friction between Russia and Japan or hasten German-inspired efforts to bring those two Far Eastern powers into accord? With the release of the Russian army in Finland, it was possible that Moscow—her army well seasoned by this time—would send her troops eastward once more; and, in fact, a border skirmish in the Mongol-Soviet sector did break out the day following the Russian victory in Europe.

Thomas, The Detroit News

The Troubles of a Ladies' Man

World-Wide Reactions

While the Kremlin counted its gains in Finland, ignoring the tremendous price it had paid in men and prestige, the world-wide reaction toward the stern Soviet peace terms was a mixture of anger at Moscow and relief that Finland had been saved at all. One bright spot for those who sympathized with Finland was the report that the "People's government of Finland" set up by Moscow at Terijoki had been liquidated.

Promptly, Finnish Foreign Minister Tanner announced that negotiations would be opened with Norway and Sweden to form a Scandinavian defense bloc. For the danger of further Soviet aggression in the north this summer seemed to be enhanced by the peace of March 13. The Russo-Finnish pact, Christian Guenther, Swedish Foreign Minister, told his Parliament, did not "in any sense mean that danger has passed." In fact, he added, as a result of Finland's altered frontiers, Sweden's position "has become worse than ever before." Many competent observers believed that even if Scandinavia united in a solid defense bloc, it would be helpless before the great powers.

Repercussions of the peace imposed upon Finland were particularly felt in Stockholm, which was smarting under criticism in Finland, Britain, France and the United States for refusing to become involved in the war. Sweden and Norway could not understand why the world condemned them, failing to realize that, with limited resources, they were forced to watch the hopeless struggle of a brave neighbor which they were unable to save for fear of precipitating a still greater tragedy by engulfing the whole of Scandinavia in war.

Many people in France and England felt a sense of shame at Finland's disaster. There was an angry debate in the British Parliament in which Russia was bitterly condemned and Britain's Finnish policy repeatedly criticized. Immediately after Prime Minister Chamberlain had eulogized the gallantry of the Finns, Leslie Hore-Belisha, former War Secretary, scored the government for not sending Finland assistance. David Lloyd George, World War Prime Minister, complained about the government's conduct of the war, saying: It is the old trouble—too late. Too late with Czecho-Slovakia, too late with Poland, certainly too late with Finland. It is always too late or too little or both, and that is the road to disaster."

In Washington, President Roosevelt voiced America's abhorrence of Russia's aggression against Finland, proclaiming the right of little nations to live in peace, unmolested by powerful neighbors. On December 1 he had declared: "It is tragic to see the policy of force spreading and to

COST OF WAR

THE PRESENT war costs the nation £6,000,000 per day, but alongside the astronomic figures of modern war costs, the bills for the great wars of the past look like a tip.

The American War of Independence cost £120,000,000, the Crimean less than two-thirds of that. The Boers cost £223,000,000.

Twenty years of fighting to get rid of Napoleon Bonaparte cost £604,000,000—a terrifying sum then, which William Pitt dealt with by introducing Britons to income tax.

In 1914, the National Debt stood at £650,000,000. By 1920 that figure had become £7,527,000,000. Four years of modern war had multiplied by more than ten thousand the accumulated debt of a century and a half.

The cost of war in 1914 has been estimated at £1,000,000 a day. By 1915 it had risen to £3,000,000 a day—a third of the national income, and by 1917 to £7,000,000 a day.—*Condensed from* The Belfast Telegraph.

realize that wanton disregard for law is still on the march." Then, as fighting ceased on the Baltic front, he added: "The people and government of Finland have again increased the respect and warm regard in which they are held by the people and government of the United States, even though it is clear that by virtue of an attack by a neighbor many times stronger, they have been compelled to yield territory, and to accept a material weakening of their own future defense of their independence."

Italy Wavers

Following the Russo-Finnish peace, Germany redoubled her efforts to arrange a Russo-Italian accord which would protect Italy's aspirations in the Balkans and induce Premier Mussolini to press his demands against France and Britain for a share in the management of the Suez Canal and an improved position in North Africa.

Chancellor Hitler, traveling to Italy, on March 18 conferred with Mussolini at Brennero, just over the Italian border. Their talk was secret, and many were the speculations concerning it. Its chief subject was said to be the possibility of securing peace. But a more widely credited belief was that it dealt with the possibility of forming a three-power entente—aimed squarely at Britain—among Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Communist Russia.

Il Duce had been having his worries, and one of them was coal. Rome protested violently when the British seized Italian colliers which had put out to sea from Rotterdam laden with German coal. The British released the ships on the promise that Italian coal vessels would no longer try to run the blockade. At the same time, the Allies, which had been buying most of the goods produced by the Italian factories for which the fuel was needed, indicated that if Italy wanted these purchases to continue, it would be wise to secure her fuel elsewhere than in Germany. Britain reminded Italy that there was coal to be had in Wales.

Less than ten days later, however, an agreement was signed in Rome between Germany and Italy arranging for the transport by land of Italian imports of German coal. Yet some economists were unable to see how Germany could supply Italy's required millions of tons each year, feeling that the railroad system could not cope with the amounts formerly sent by sea.

In mid-March, during the Italo-British crisis over the coal ships, Joachim von Ribbentrop, German Foreign Minister, had hastened to Rome, but his mission was somewhat dampened when Britain released the seized vessels. Undaunted, however, Ribbentrop consulted twice with Mussolini. He also called on Pope Pius XII. Generally, the world press editorialized to the effect that the Ribbentrop trip was a failure. Yet Italy seemed to remain an enigma to both the Allies and Germany as she wavered first toward one side and then the other. As a reminder to Mussolini that his Ethiopia is not invulnerable, the English War Office ostentatiously allowed the news to leak out that the boundary between Ethiopia and Kenya Colony is lined with British troops. Italy's sense of security increased, however, when in mid-March she was able to announce that she had constructed her equivalent of the French Maginot Line and of the German Westwall on the Italo-German frontier, as well as on the French, Swiss and Yugoslav borders.

Fitzpatrick, The Raleigh News and Observer

On the Mediterranean Front

Hungerford, The Pittsburgh Post Gazette

Fire's Out!

Trouble Due in India?

A pistol shot rang out in London one day in mid-March. It took the life of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, former Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, and re-echoed like a thunder clap in far away India. There the All-India Nationalist Congress was split over ways and means to gain complete independence for India. The slaying of O'Dwyer, the wounding of the Marquess of Zetland, Secretary of State for India, and Lord Lamington and Sir Louis Dane, former Indian administrators, by an East Indian was considered as possibly a political act to impress the Congress in India.

Mohandas K. Gandhi had been advocating non-violence in India for the duration of the war. But Subhas Chandra Bose, former Congress President and leader of the anti-compromise bloc, demanded more drastic measures to enforce India's demand for independence. He heartily disagreed with his former leader and assailed Gandhi as "weak-kneed in the way he has abandoned the struggle for independence because Britain is at war." The Congress party met to draft a program for the coming year, with Gandhi heartily cheered at the opening sessions, but facing a hard fight to maintain control.

The Reality of International Law

Although much abused the law of nations is still a vital factor in wartime diplomacy

PHILIP C. JESSUP

"INTERNATIONAL law during war"! most people greet the very idea with a snort of incredulity.

They may be incredulous because they lack familiarity with the actual conduct of international affairs; because they overemphasize the spectacular cases in which the law is flouted; because they accept newspaper reports as gospel truth; or because they have a mistaken idea of the certainty and uniformity of private law. Consider the last point first.

The states of the United States inherited the English common law; they have this common basic reservoir of legal principles. New York and Massachusetts have it. But if you mail a letter in Albany to Mr. Smith in Buffalo accepting his offer to sell you a gold watch, and then you change your mind and send a telegram which reaches him before the letter arrives saying you won't buy it, according to the New York courts you are nevertheless bound to pay. If the same correspondence were between Boston and Worcester, according to the Massachusetts courts, you are not bound to pay. So in the field of our maritime law. All our federal courts apply the same general body of maritime law, but your rights in a particular transaction may depend on whether you sue in the Second or in the Ninth Circuit.

To be sure, under our system, you may in some of these cases ultimately get a standard interpretation of the law by carrying the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States. It is "standard" at any rate unless and until the Supreme Court reverses itself in later years. But when such divergencies and differences exist within the framework of our well-developed national law, is it surprising that, with fifty odd nations in the world, similar differences exist in international law? As the late Mr. Justice Cardozo well said, the differences must not "blind our eyes to the innumerable instances where there is neither obscurity nor opportunity for diverse judgment."

In international law, you can not automatically carry your case to an authoritative supreme court; yet the World Court is still sitting at The Hague and its decisions are very close to "standard" despite the fact that acceptance of them is voluntary and cannot be enforced by any marshal or sheriff.

That same lack of enforcement exists in an important field of our constitutional law—that which concerns the action of any one of our states. In 1832, the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Chief Justice Marshall, rendered a judgment that the decision of a court of the State of Georgia be "reversed and annulled." Governor Lumpton of Georgia cried "Usurpation!" and said he would meet the decision "with the spirit of determined resistance." President Jackson defiantly declared, "John Marshall has made his decision: now let him enforce it!" And, the historian of the Supreme Court concludes, the Court "found itself powerless . . . the mandate was never obeyed, never heeded." Yet we do not hesitate to speak of constitutional law as "law".

The international society is still in its infancy, compared to the stage of development achieved by national states. International law develops slowly and is often flouted, but it has reality. If it had none, you would not find our Department of State and the Foreign Offices of all the other great countries staffed with lawyers advising daily on questions of international law; you would not find, in critical times like these, governments bothering to argue their claims on legal grounds; you would not find propaganda ministries trying to convince the world that their country obeys the law of nations and that the enemy is a violator of that law; you would not find the British Court of Admiralty and Court of Appeal deciding prize cases on the basis of international law.

It is necessary to say a word about prize cases. A vast volume of the world's business is carried on by shipments over seas. In time of war, belligerents capture many of these ships—that is their right under international law. But they do not seize and confiscate the cargo out of hand. For over three hundred years they have regularly put these cases through the "prize courts" which decide, for example, whether the neutral owner of a cargo will get it back or whether he forfeits it because it is "contraband of war" or comes under some other rule of international law justifying condemnation. The man who owns a ship or a cargo crossing the oceans nowadays has a very practical interest in international law.

International law has not prevented wars. Neither has constitutional law prevented civil wars. International law applies chiefly to the ordinary routine life of nations in time of peace—to questions of the immunity of ambassadors, the rights of consuls, the interpretation of commercial treaties, and so on. Most of our private law deals with contracts

to buy things, suits for damages caused by automobiles, titles to bits of land and other simple matters of daily life.

When international war breaks out, a new branch of international law becomes applicable. The fighting nations have "belligerent" rights and duties; the nations not actually involved in the war have "neutral" rights and duties. In time of peace, the warships of Great Britain could not stop an American ship on the high seas; now that England is at war, they have the legal right to do so. In time of peace, a British squadron of warships could pay us a visit and anchor for a week or more in the Hudson River to be inspected by thousands of visitors to the World's Fair. Now that England is at war, it would be a breach of our neutral duty if we let them stay for more than twenty-four hours. It was because of this rule that Germany's *Graf Spee* could not prolong her stay at Montevideo last December and was scuttled.

It would take too much space to explain the historical why and wherefore of each of the many rules of neutrality and of belligerent rights, but they are not purely arbitrary. Each has a reason rooted in the history of some three hundred years. Most of them have a common origin in the inevitable conflict between belligerent and neutral interests. The belligerent naturally wants to do everything he can to overcome his enemy. The neutral naturally sees no reason why his life should be disrupted because two other nations choose to fight. Through the years, by treaties and by common practices, a set of rules has developed. They are mostly compromises between these conflicting interests and, like all compromises, cannot be tested by logic. But once they have become established in the customs and practices of the nations, they are known as international law, and the nation that breaks the rule is a law breaker even though it can not be jailed for the offense.

What are some of these rules? They may be looked at in terms of incidents which have been played up in the newspapers during the past few months.

There was the *City of Flint*, an American ship bound from New York to England with a mixed cargo. In the middle of the Atlantic a German battleship stopped her. Following the usual procedure, she was first

PHILIP JESSUP, who was born in New York in 1897, is a distinguished member of the New York bar—an expert in the field of international law. A graduate of Hamilton College in 1919, he has been honored by Yale and Columbia, where he now serves as lecturer and professor. Mr. Jessup has frequently assisted the government at home and abroad and is a member of many important legal committees. He has written extensively, both books and magazine articles, and is one of the editors of *The American Journal of International Law*. During the last war he served with the A.E.F. and was decorated by the Hungarian government. As a specialist with a world wide reputation Mr. Jessup is equally at ease as an active lawyer, university lecturer and author.

searched by a boarding party and then captured on the ground that she was carrying contraband to the enemy. The law of contraband has had a checkered history, involving many disagreements, but no government has yet undertaken to deny that there is a law of contraband and that (theoretically at least) some things are contraband and some are not.

The contraband list of the United States when we entered the World War in 1917 was extensive, and so are the contraband lists of England, France and Germany today. A belligerent always has a right to capture a neutral ship on the high seas if he has reason to believe that she is carrying contraband. In the normal course of events the captor takes the ship into one of his ports so that the Prize Court can decide whether his suspicions were justified.

If they were, the cargo is condemned and forfeited, and in some cases the ship pays the same penalty. If the prize court finds that the captor was wrong (and this has often been the case), the ship and cargo are restored to their owners, free to go their way. Sometimes, the captor even has to pay damages for his mistake.

There are, however, other grounds for capture and condemnation. One of them is an attempt to run a blockade; another is what is known as "unneutral service" which may consist in carrying enemy troops, or despatches, or acting as an auxiliary to the enemy fleet. There is also a legal alternative, in some situations, to bringing the ship into port. If the latter procedure endangers the safety of the warship or the success of the operations in which it is engaged, the captured vessel may be sunk after those on board have been put in a place of safety. Humanity and law here combine to declare that the practice of which the Germans seem to have been guilty—setting people adrift in small boats on a wintry sea—is not providing for their safety.

The legal objections to submarine warfare are not based primarily on the fact that vessels have been sunk, but on failure to provide for the safety of passengers and crew. The belligerent with command of the seas or many ports scattered around the world, will in general have less reason for sinking a captured "prize." If the captor is taking the ship into port, he may escort it there or may place a "prize crew" on board which forces the vessel's own captain and crew to sail the ship under its orders.

It has been said above that the captor is to bring the captured ship into one of its own ports, but there was a time when under various treaties prizes could be taken into nearby ports. In recent years, that has generally not been allowed, and the Unit-

ed States, among others, insists that it is a breach of neutrality for the neutral to permit this practice. That was the reason why our government protested when it appeared that the Germans were trying to have the *City of Flint* laid up in the Russian port of Murmansk, Russia being considered a "neutral" so far as the war between Germany and the Allies is concerned. After the German prize crew finally brought the *City of Flint* into a Norwegian port contrary to the orders of the Norwegian Government, the prize crew was taken off by the authorities and the *City of Flint* was set free.

Neutral Norway has been the center of another famous case—the *Altmark*. This was a German ship with the apparent status of a warship because of service as an auxiliary to the German navy. She had on board about 300 prisoners, crew members of British merchantmen which had been captured and sunk by the *Graf Spee*. Under international law, these captured sailors of belligerent nationality were treated as prisoners of war. That they were seamen on merchant vessels rather than warships does not, under the law, save them in time of war.

The *Altmark*, trying to run the British blockade, was sailing down through Norwegian waters on her way to Germany. Although belligerent warships may not stay more than twenty-four hours in a neutral port, they may pass through neutral waters. There would be no breach of neutrality if the United States allowed a Canadian warship to steam from Maine to Florida inside of the three-mile limit, especially if that were an ordinary steamship route. The neutral has the privilege of excluding warships, but it also has the privilege of letting them enter. The fact that there were prisoners on board made no difference in Norway's neutral duty. She had no obligation to find out if they were there because even if she had done so, she would have had no duty, and no right, to release them.

In international law a belligerent must confine its warlike activities to areas outside of neutral territory—including under "territory," land, airspace and territorial waters. The *Ajax* and the *Exeter* observed that rule when they stopped outside of Uruguayan waters when the *Graf Spee* went in. In the *Altmark* case, the plight of the British prisoners was too much for the British navy and they violated Norwegian neutrality by dashing in and effecting a rescue. The British Government has alleged that it had justifications, but the reports so far published do not show a legal excuse for this breach of a rule which was well recognized three hundred years ago.

It has already been noted that ordinarily when a neutral vessel is captured on the high seas, she is brought in for prize proceedings at the risk of the captor, who may be ordered by the Prize Court to pay damages if the capture was not justified. In recent times, belligerents have sought to avoid this inconvenience by compelling all ships within certain areas to put in to "control" ports where they are searched. Afterwards, they may be told that they are free to go on their way. In these cases the belligerents have said they never "captured" the ship and no question of damages can arise. But the ship has suffered a great financial loss by being diverted from her course and forced to lie idle for days or even weeks. The United States protested against this practice during the World War and our protests today have been justified.

One particular source of objection in these cases has been due to the interference with the mails. Again we find that the United States objected to the practice both in the World War and during the present war. Italy has recently added her protest. Objections were based on one of the great law-making treaties—the Hague Convention—which declared that mails were inviolable. But Britain insisted that this treaty referred only to genuine correspondence and could not be used to protect shipment of money and articles of all kinds which were being sent through to Germany. During the World War, we properly conceded that the Hague treaty did not cover parcels post, but we gave our case away by admitting that rubber, chemicals, bonds, securities and so on could be seized as contraband even though in the mails. The British naturally pointed out that they would have to open all letters to find what was inside. We had reason to believe that they were also collecting a vast amount of information about business and were using this information not only to fight the war but to build up their own commerce.

We now admit that if a ship voluntarily comes into a British port bringing mail for Britain, the British have a right to censor it. But there does not seem to be much basis for any special excitement because the British took the mail bags off the Pan American clippers when they stopped at Bermuda on their flights to Europe. We don't admit that the British can force the ship to come in to a British port and then put the mail through the censor on the theory that it is within their jurisdiction. And the argument about removing contraband from the mails does not apply when the British authorities take mail bags off ships bound from Italy to the United States.

Presumably Great Britain justifies

(*Continued on page* 61)

The Duesseldorf Incident

The *Duesseldorf*, a German freighter was captured by the British off Chile and sent under a prize crew to Jamaica, via the Panama Canal. The German crew were prisoners on board. Under our treaties, we are bound to keep the Canal open to warships and merchantships of all nations. The President's proclamation of last September 5th says prizes are subject to the same treatment as warships, so the *Duesseldorf* went through. Hans von Appen was among the German prisoners on board. According to the newspapers, he said he had appendicitis and demanded that he be put ashore. He objected to the Canal Zone Hospital and was sent to a Panama Hospital. His medical examination was not completed within the twenty-four hours allowed the *Duesseldorf* to stay in the waters of the Canal, so he was left behind. Later the Panama doctors said he was not ill and he was sent back to the Canal Zone. The American authorities in the Canal Zone surrendered him to the British, apparently on the ground that he got off the ship by fraudulent representations and therefore had no right to be set free. If the British had voluntarily put him on shore, he would have been released. If he had remained on board, he would have remained a prisoner like the other members of the German crew whose fate he now shares.

Sweden: Her Tragic Dilemma

Less than forty miles from Russia's guns, her life may hang on an iron thread

MARQUIS W. CHILDS

WHILE the sequence of events is different, the tragedy that is being played out on the Scandinavian Peninsula is not unlike the disaster that overwhelmed the Iberian Peninsula in the south of Europe two years ago. The period of the Spanish war was for Scandinavia, and Sweden in particular, one of peace and high prosperity. The suggestion that in some future time the great powers might intervene in Europe's northern peninsula, as they had in the south, was greeted with derisive laughter. No such catastrophe could occur where the people themselves were so well integrated and internal dissensions so rare. That was the confident attitude of almost everyone.

The war in Spain began, of course, with a revolution which was used as the justification for foreign invasion. In Sweden the pressure applied by the powers on either side of the European divide created a profound divergence of opinion which still threatens to result in an internal split.

Events moved very fast. The present government in Sweden—Social-Democratic, with the addition of leaders from other parties—was caught on the horns of a cruel dilemma. If Finland fell, then democratic, prosperous Sweden existed within the range of Soviet guns and Soviet bombers—a scant forty miles across the Gulf of Bothnia from the Aland Islands. But if Sweden openly entered the war on the side of her beleaguered neighbor, there was every likelihood that Germany would intervene actively on the side of her Russian ally. In any event, the Swedish government was convinced that Germany would intervene and therefore decided to remain neutral.

Faced with this decision for strict neutrality, which appeared to bar the way to aid from the Allies, Finland was brought to tragic capitulation. In any event, as Leslie Hore-Belisha had the courage to say in the House of Commons on March 13, the proffers of real aid from Great Britain and France came too late. Whether there was ever a time when the Allies might have come to effective terms with Sweden and Norway, it is impossible, from present sources of knowledge, to say. It may be that the timidity of the Swedish government, the pathetic illusion of separate security, made it impossible from the beginning. From any practical point of view, however, the eleventh hour statements by Chamberlain and Daladier seem to have been worse than futile.

King Gustaf

In the middle of the winter it appeared that many influential Germans were strongly opposed to Russian conquest of Finland and actually hoped to facilitate the movement of aid to the Finns. There were authoritative reports that members of the German general staff had encouraged the Swedes to believe they could replace, from German stores, military supplies they sent to the Finns. This pro-Finnish opinion centered in Field Marshal Goering, who stood in more or less open opposition to such Nazi radicals as Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop.

But soon it became apparent that Germany's own military position demanded that the Finnish situation be liquidated as speedily as possible with a Soviet triumph. Goering has many Swedish connections that go back to his first marriage. He sought out his Swedish friends to tell them that, if Sweden went into the war openly on the side of Finland, Germany would be compelled either to enter the war openly on the Russian side or, at least, to launch an immediate attack on Sweden by air. Goering knew that word of this would reach the Swedish foreign office at once, as, of course, it did.

In the view of the Swedish government, the Nazis, through naval action in the Baltic, could soon put an end to virtually all aid to Finland. Most of the munitions, supplies and volunteer forces sent to the Finns have reached Helsinki by water. German submarines and bombers could quickly end this flow of aid in the Baltic, the Swedish government was convinced. The only land line is a single track railroad around the Gulf of Bothnia through Haparanda and Tornea. Obviously no very substantial help could be sent by that route.

It is argued, particularly by Americans who condemn Sweden for her course, that Germany could not have afforded to attack Sweden, since she depends on Swedish iron ore to supply her steel mills. But if Sweden had waged active and open war on Finland the line of ore boats would no longer have gone from Lulea down to Hamburg, for the Swedes would naturally have thrown all their resources of ships, men, and munitions into such a war. So the Nazis would have had nothing to lose. And by a swift and demoralizing attack, they might conceivably have forced Sweden to a speedy surrender which would again have assured the movement of iron ore to German mills.

Another factor in the Swedish government's decision to stay neutral was skepticism as to the degree of aid which could be counted upon from the Allies in the event of a German attack. It is no secret that, whatever the reason, the help which reached Finland from Britain and France was slight. A trickle of volunteers was encouraged at a time when a considerable force, supported by all the implements of modern warfare, was the desperate need of the Finns. This is not to overlook the fact, of course, that a force unaccustomed to northern warfare might at first have been of little avail to Finland. Nor is it to overlook the attitude of the Swedes themselves which may have been one reason for the Allies' hesitation. Nevertheless the Swedish government had grave doubts that any more considerable help would be forthcoming for Sweden than for Finland.

Moreover, there was a question as to the real intention of the Allies. Did they mean merely in their own self-interest to transfer the war to another front? It is, of course, always desirable to fight a war in another backyard than your own. To have engaged German strength in Scandinavia, in whatever degree, naturally would have benefited the British and French. In the present waiting war, with both sides jealously guarding their full resources, any such advantage counts.

Directly below the "H" in Helsingfors is located the strategic island of Hangoe, "leased" to Russia for thirty years. Situated at the junction of the Gulf of Finland, Bothnia and the Baltic Sea, it dominates Scandinavian waters and threatens the iron ore center at Lulea.

Add to this a very great Swedish fear of German might, especially of the German air fleet. We're not afraid of the Russians, the Swedes have said. It is Germany we fear. Malmo, the port city in the extreme south of Sweden, is within easy reach of the Nazis' formidable air armada. Stockholm is not more than two hours beyond.

The opposition to the government in Sweden was drawn from various sources. For the most part its elements were united only by an angry determination to compel a change and bring Sweden into the war. A considerable section of the officer class in both the army and the navy was in this opposition. The officers represent the point of view of military strategists who argue that it will be impossible to defend Sweden once a hostile power has occupied Finland and fortified the Aland Islands in the Gulf of Bothnia. They argued that the Mannerheim Line was Sweden's first line of defense and that to see it go without a struggle was merely to sit and wait your turn for the executioner's axe.

In this formidable opposition also were many left wing members of the Social-Democratic party, leaders such as Frederick Ström, president of the Stockholm town council. In part they were animated, it would seem, by an old mistrust of the Soviets and the policy of the Comintern. Far deeper than this, of course, in the Swedish temperament is an ancient fear of Russia that goes back to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when the Czar was the traditional enemy and mothers frightened their children into obedience with the threat that a bearded Russian would come to carry them off.

Not a little of the opposition centered around Rickard Sandler who gave up his post as Foreign Minister under persistent threats from the Nazi press. Mr. Sandler had long favored a more active policy in Scandinavia with direct collaboration for defense among the northern countries. He has, however, been something less than frank in recent speeches in the Riksdag, never openly urging that Sweden enter the war in Finland's behalf.

Another factor in the opposition—and it will continue to be a factor in Swedish politics now that a bitter peace has been forced upon Finland—was the importance of the links, military, financial and cultural, that bind Finland and Sweden. For generations Swedish families have been numbered among the Finnish ruling classes. This situation goes back to the time when Finland was a Swedish province, before the Russian conquest of 1809. These families have regarded themselves as belonging to Finland although they never quite gave up their Swedish ties. Connections of birth and marriage link the two nations. For example, Baron Mannerheim's sister is married to

Count Sparre, descendant of one of Sweden's oldest noble families. Countess Sparre has been touring the United States on behalf of Finland.

The unanswerable argument of the opposition was that, if Sweden was to sacrifice her independence, it was better to go down fighting. At least there might be a chance that way.

WHETHER the Soviets intend to try to dominate the Scandinavian peninsula is not known. There have been various rumors that Russia and Germany proposed to divide Scandinavia into spheres of influence or even into spheres of ownership. Early in the Finnish war it was reported that a map was being circulated showing the exact demarcations of this partition. Certainly it would seem that the Soviets, by the terms of the peace Finland was compelled to accept, would be in a position to exercise domination over Sweden. They will possess a strategic railroad across Finland to the Gulf of Bothnia.

The only restraint might come from Germany, Russia's partner to the south, concerned with a continuous flow of ore from the iron mines in Lapland. This puts Sweden in the position of depending upon Germany for security, a tragic and humiliating position indeed for such a proud and successful democracy. Faced with this bitter humiliation at least one courageous editor, Torgny Segerstedt, has spoken out freely to warn his countrymen that Sweden was increasingly regarded abroad as "a small German dependency."

There is a possibility, of course, that this spring the Soviets will be forced to meet an attack in the east. In this, say those who have supported the government position in Sweden, lies the only real hope for the Finns. Germany also may be engaged by the Allies in a more vigorous kind of war in the west. For the time being at least, this would remove the threat of actual domination by either of the two totalitarian powers. For the more remote future, the hope is that the war's final outcome on the western front is such that neither Russia nor Germany will be able to exercise control in the north.

All this has served to obscure the very great help that Sweden had dispatched to the heroic Finns. The total value of this aid was approximately $100,000,000, which for a country of six million people was no mean achievement. About one-fourth of this was in actual money made available to the government of Finland. The balance was in munitions and supplies.

At the beginning of the Russian invasion there were serious gaps in the Finnish defense. Conspicuously, the Finns lacked anti-tank guns. From Sweden's highly organized munitions plants great numbers of these were sent to the Finnish front and they were most effective in checking the Russian advance. Similarly the notable anti-aircraft gun developed by Bofors in Sweden was shipped in considerable numbers to Helsinki for the defense of that unhappy city.

Almost every military necessity was supplied by the Swedes, nominally, at least, through voluntary contributions. Aid came from all classes. At the outset the Nazis threatened to block the flow of this voluntary aid, but after a brief period, it was again allowed.

More difficult to estimate is the number of volunteer troops from Sweden who fought with the Finns. Some sources put the figure at 10,000, with many more who were on the way or soon to be inducted into the fighting force after a preliminary training period. Others insist that the total was much larger. Certainly the number would be greater if volunteers for work as well as war were included. From Sweden, Denmark and Norway volunteer workers, organized by the trade unions, were sent to take the place in factory and forest of Finnish workers at the front.

In the light of this great mass effort the Swedes were inclined to ask why so little help was extended to Finland in the United States. Why is it, they asked that your country, the greatest country in the world, with so many rich inhabitants, contributed only $2,000,000 through private sources for the aid of Finland? It was, perhaps, unkind to point out that Sweden had an immediate and direct self-interest in saving her nearest neighbor. But, the rejoinder is, your President talked about "measures short of war" to aid the democracies in their stand against the dictatorships. Surely, if ever there was an opportunity to come to the aid of a democracy menaced by a dictatorship, it was in Finland. And yet your government authorized only $30,000,000 in loans and that money had to be used for the purchase of commodities and not for vital weapons of defense.

THERE is no doubt that this has been the cause of considerable feeling, not alone in Sweden but in Finland as well. You give us kind words, the hurt rebuke was, and not the means for saving our very lives. From American sources comes criticism of Sweden for not rushing openly to Finland's aid. This mutual mistrust will be fed by a very natural desire to escape the blame for this latest disaster after the tragic pattern of Czecho-Slovakia, Spain and China.

All reports from Sweden indicate that every day the face of this peaceful land is being altered. Bomb shelters are being built in Stockholm and in other large towns. Troops are everywhere, an anomalous sight in the Swedish countryside. An atmosphere of gloom and apprehension pervades a people who so recently were living at a peak of prosperity and contentment. While the Socialist government in recent years has broken away from precedent and reliance on the collective security of the League of Nations system to adopt larger defense appropriations, this step has not been sufficient for preparedness. Now night and day the preparation for defense goes forward.

The chance that Sweden will emerge from the present world conflict as an independent democracy would seem today to be slight. Besides the pressure of powerful neighbors, there is, growing out of that pressure, grave internal dissension, though it may be exaggerated in the present moment of national crisis.

This dissension is all the more tragic because until the beginning of the present war there was such wide-

(Continued on page 60)

Holland Looks to Her Dikes

Although this writer believes she will escape invasion, the Dutch are prepared for the worst

CORNELIUS VANDERBREGGEN, JR.

GERMAN TROOPS are going to march through Holland—that prediction will be made and remade as long as there is a peaceful valley in the sea called Holland and a warring Europe around it.

The Nazi invasion of Holland was announced by an excited American radio news reporter one evening in April, 1939—and shortly thereafter denied. It has been mapped out daily by armchair strategists since Hitler's troops marched into Poland last September. It was represented as inevitable on the week-end of November 11, 1939—but failed to materialize. It made the headlines again a few weeks ago.

As long as this war lasts The Netherlands will continue to be subjected to theoretical conquests. Its ports will be seized vicariously by raiders round-the-dinner-table. Its leading cities will be bombed, its dikes will be blown up, its land will be inundated by invaders who never leave their armchairs.

But German troops will not set foot on Dutch soil—for at least three good reasons:

1. If Germany were to launch a drive straight across Holland to seize the naval bases of Flushing and Rotterdam and the airports at Eindhoven, Amsterdam and Soesterberg she would be confronted by the much discussed Dutch inundation system.

She would have to transport her soldiers, trucks, tanks and heavy guns through an unnavigable lake only a few inches deep, a lake strewn with mines, intersected by a maze of invisible canals, and defended from dry land by a valiant Dutch army that in relation to the area it has to defend is the largest military force in Europe.

Most informed people in Holland feel confident that the Dutch could repel a German invasion for at least a month. Dutch people are rarely confident without reason.

Holland is better prepared today than she has ever been before. During the past months pill boxes have sprung up like mushrooms in hundreds of places. Bomb shelters have been constructed in important cities. Citizens have been moved from many possible danger zones to districts in western Holland. One area on the inundation line has already been put under water. The Red Cross has given instruction on wartime emergencies to hundreds of Dutch women and girls. All of this has been done quietly, efficiently, without publicity —in true Dutch fashion.

It has been done not because the people fear invasion, but because they feel that being prepared for an undesirable event often prevents its occurrence.

2. If the Nazis, in spite of Dutch preparedness, were to invade Holland, throw staggering infantry forces against the water line, rain bombs upon the defenders, and penetrate into western Holland, they still might not gain their objectives. The part of Holland defended by the water line is also under-sea-level territory. Although it would not be inundated as an original defense measure it contains huge areas, reclaimed from inland lakes and rivers during the past three centuries, which once again could be put under water. Unquestionably, if necessity arose, the Dutch would destroy by water as the Finns have destroyed by fire.

And what would happen to the coveted Dutch ports and airfields? The island on which Flushing is located would have its dikes blown up, and the ocean would roll in to cover everything except the majestic sand dunes along the North Sea and the River Scheldt. Ships would be sunk in the Mass River so that Rotterdam would be blocked off from the sea. Amsterdam, if threatened, would be rendered useless as a port by the destruction of the locks of the ten mile North Sea Canal which connects that city with the ocean. The airports, many of them situated on former lake bottoms, would be again covered with water or blown up by dynamite.

There is one circumstance under which this destruction would be unnecessary: if Allied troops were brought into western Holland to check the Germans. But that would be as bad for the Nazis as opening up their Westwall. Then they might

New York Times

Possible Routes of Invasion

swiftly become the attacked instead of the attackers. An additional two hundred miles of relatively weakly fortified border would be theirs to defend. Emden, Bremen, the Kiel Canal and the Ruhr district would be easily accessible targets for French and British bombers.

The Dutch know—and the Germans surely know—that a *blitzkrieg* against watchful, mobilized Holland can never succeed. Only a totally successful *blitzkrieg* could interest the Germans, for a half-successful invasion would be worse than none: therein lies Holland's greatest chance for remaining unmolested by Germany.

3. There is still another possible reason why the Germans will not violate Dutch neutrality: they may not want to. Repeatedly they have affirmed that they do not plan to invade Holland, and that rumors crediting them with such intentions are but Allied propaganda. Few people have believed these affirmations, but that is perhaps unwise.

Actually a neutral Holland is a great protection to Germany. It is the Allies who are being hindered by the fact that the Dutch are stubborn enough not to want their country to become the battleground for other nations. Holland shields Germany's most vulnerable flank and blocks England's most direct route to Berlin. Honest Britons will admit it.

Perhaps that is why London merchants were telling Dutch business acquaintances a year ago that they'd better "do their part" in the "next war" if they hoped to maintain old trade relationships after it. Perhaps that is why Winston Churchill has been so eager to proffer his unctuous advice to the neutrals.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the Low Country scares of which we have read so much in our press since last September have been engineered by a subtle English propaganda machine desirous of intensifying world opinion against Nazidom and using for its purposes a pump which Germany's World War invasion of Belgium has already primed.

The Dutch realize that they may be faced with more difficult problems than relations with Germany. All along they have known that if war came their neutrality would become a pawn on the chessboard of power politics. As an Amsterdam business man said to the writer a year ago: "Holland must always act on the assumption that no big European nation is its benevolent friend. In the event of war we will have just as much to fear from England's trying to force us into the conflict as from Germany's invading us."

Temporarily Holland is safe on both fronts. Its perfected defense system will protect it from Nazi troops on the east. Its astute Queen and able ministers will guard it against British invitations to belligerency on the west.

The Dutch inundation system is interesting but frequently misrepresented. All too often the impression has been given that if Holland were attacked Queen Wilhelmina could press a button at the Royal Palace in The Hague and central Holland would become a ten-feet-deep sea of swirling water. That is a dramatic but highly fantastic idea.

Forty per cent of Holland is below the level of rivers and of the sea at high tide. These low-lying areas, however, do not form a huge basin which could be flooded by the blowing up of a few dikes, or even a hundred dikes. On the contrary, the low regions are made up of scores and scores of polders, dike-surrounded

(Continued on page 64)

Great Britain's Ironside

The military burden of England's war is carried by a tall, tough, 60-year-old Scot

ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ

CHIEF of the Imperial General Staff, Sir Edmund Ironside, is Britain's most popular soldier, and because of his plan, before the recent culmination of the Russo-Finnish War, to send strong military aid to the little nation, he has become a popular hero at home. "Brilliant" is the word to describe the agile mind which guides British grand strategy on land. Not only a brilliant military man, he is a brilliant linguist and conversationalist. Sir Edmund can turn a neat phrase and also express an original idea. He has acquired a fine service record, yet also the reputation of talking, at times, out of turn. By sheer hard work and imaginative daring, in the manner of the late Lawrence of Arabia, he has risen. With Lawrence he has more than one quirk of mind in common.

Ironside has that flair for languages—he speaks sixteen—and that talent for mimicry which enabled Lawrence to submerge himself in the Arabian world. Ironside's exploits in German South West Africa, where, disguised as a wagon driver, he studied the secrets of German colonial defenses, are reminiscent of Lawrence's feats. With Lawrence, Ironside shares contempt for fashionable society and for the bureaucratic niceties of army routine. Like Lawrence, Ironside is a blend of politician and warrior, and again, like Lawrence, is an author in his own right. His book *Tannenberg* is a military classic.

But there the parallel ends. To his countrymen Lawrence became a hero, but an eccentric hero with a grievance. His ascetic features and his propensity for Arab garb, no less than his championship of the Arab cause, were part of the epic which profoundly moved the generation of the World War. But to official England Hero Lawrence was disturbing. There is nothing disturbing about Sir Edmund—at least about his exterior. His six feet four of height and 258 pounds of weight provide the impressive proportions in which John Bull likes to see his public figures. Shrewd observers believe that his physique has been an inestimable help in Ironside's career and that only behind so much bulk could so original and un-English a mind have been smuggled into the War Office holy of holies.

When "Big Bill" Ironside, attired in yellow corduroy trousers and sport coat, took over his duties of Chief of Staff at the War Office in September, 1939, his massive frame, his brindle bulldogs, his long cigars, his battery of pipes and his very name furnished British journalism with copy and color. Great Britain had found not only the man to direct her troops but also a rugged symbol of her war efforts.

Sir Edmund is a Scot. Born sixty years ago as the son of Surgeon Major William Ironside, at Ironside, Aberdeenshire, he started his military career with the Royal Artillery in 1899—and forthwith started the Ironside legend also. His name is mentioned in the dispatches of the Boer War. Having mastered the Boer dialect, he was claimed by the Intelligence Service. Later, as a wagon driver, he joined German troops in a campaign in German South Africa against rebellious natives; his duty was to obtain a first-hand view of German tactics—in short, to act as a spy. Not without some narrow squeaks, he completed his mission, was commended, and disappeared into the routine existence of a British army officer.

Then came the World War with its breath-taking promotions.

Ironside was the first British officer to land in France, and promptly proceeded to pile up his military record. The gunner-Captain of 1914 was Brigadier General in 1916 with a Distinguished Service Order to his name. He took over command of the 99th Brigade of Canadians, famed for valor and unruliness. At about that time he seems to have begun to speak his mind too well and freely, and to have ruffled certain quarters higher up. But he also disappointed those who had hoped that the tough Canadians would wear him down. He proved himself tougher. Big Bill, also known as "Tiny," stalked through the trenches with brindle bulldog and polished hiker's stick, the idol of his men.

A Major General at thirty-eight, he was given another command which would have broken a lesser man. As Commander in Chief of the Allied forces at the North-Russian port of Archangel he managed to shine, in an uncomfortable position, as able leader of a polyglot army, and as a skillful diplomat. The expedition landed in 1918 to forestall a German thrust to the Arctic. The Germans failed to make good their advance, and Ironside found himself opposed by the Bolsheviks' propaganda instead of the Kaiser's soldiers. The morale of the Allied forces, assembled from British, French, American, Chinese and sundry contingents, was not high. Ironside, haranguing his soldiers in many

languages, performed prodigies in maintaining discipline and inspiring his listless troops with a spirit of cohesion. At last, he received orders to withdraw. Without too great a loss of prestige, he evacuated Archangel. He took with him a few more languages, an intimate knowledge of Arctic strategy, and of the tangled intrigues of the Red Revolution. A knighthood was the reward for his Arctic services.

Thereafter he was sent to another post of lost hopes. He took over the command of the Ismid Force at Constantinople, another polyglot Allied army with a political mission. After Turkey's surrender in 1918, the Allies had moved their troops to the Turkish capital lest Bolshevik Russia take advantage of Turkey's weakness to obtain control of the narrows between the Black Sea and the Aegean. To Prime Minister Lloyd George, Sir Edmund seemed just the man to deal with Turks, Greeks, Bolsheviks, and the intrigues on the Golden Horn. Again Sir Edmund accomplished a feat of extrication, this time maneuvering against the Turkish troops of Kemal Pasha, later known at Ataturk. At this time he remarked wryly to a friend that he seemed to have become a specialist in retreats.

In this role he also appeared, in 1920, in North Persia where another Allied scheme for crushing the Bolsheviks had fallen into trouble. He superintended the withdrawal of the North Persian force from the Caucasus region of Russia and later from Mesopotamia, now Iraq. In passing he put a certain Rheza Khan in command of a Persian cavalry division and thus on the way to the throne of Persia. An aeroplane accident, in which both his thighs were broken, closed Sir Edmund's Near Eastern chapter.

LITTLE more was heard of him until 1922. Then, at forty-two and hale and hearty, he took over the command of the Staff College at Chamberley. Four years later he was gazetted General in Command of the troops at Meerut, India. After holding this humdrum post for three years, he was appointed to the lieutenancy of the Tower of London. This honor, conferred usually upon decorative gentlemen in their dotage, seemed to mark the end of his military career.

His recent biographers in the British press ascribe these frequent eclipses to clashes between the progressive young general and stuffy superiors. There is little evidence to sustain this contention, which today helps to "humanize" the august person of the Chief of Staff. But roving Ironside managed to come to rest at the right post at the right moment while acquiring valuable experience during the less spectacular interludes of his service.

In 1936 he advanced, now a full general at fifty-six, to the Command of the Middle Eastern forces, one of the key posts of Britain's Imperial defenses. Then he returned to assume at $16,500 a year, the command of England's eastern area which includes London—a key post of English home defense. And when in 1938 he took over the Governor Generalship of Gibraltar it certainly did not mean demotion. After the Ethiopian crisis and the tragi-comedy of non-intervention in Spain, the Rock had to be entrusted to the ablest man on the lists. Its defenses needed overhauling; it was feared that, should war break over the Mediterranean, German and Italian pressure on Spain would imperil Britain's strongpoint at the Imperial lifeline to Malta and to Suez. Sir Edmund lost no time in overhauling the defensive system of Gibraltar. He threw a string of concrete fortifications across the isthmus which links the rock to the mainland, and dug tunnels into the side of the rock itself as shelters for the civilian population of the fortress. New gun emplacements attested to Ironside's awareness of the changed position of Gibraltar and its harbor which is now within easy range of Spanish batteries installed on the heights above Algeciras.

When the job on Gibraltar was done England's fears of war in the Mediterranean had subsided but a new chapter had been added to the Ironside legend. There was a catchy image in the association of two names, of man and rock: Ironside and Gibraltar.

With Hore-Belisha in the War Ministry and Captain Liddell Hart, the military critic, at Hore-Belisha's elbow, the long delayed house cleaning of Britain's military establishment at last got under way. Changes in personnel followed hard upon reforms in the army's technical organization. Aged generals were shoved aside. Sir Edmund was chosen over fifty officers of senior rank as Inspector General of the Overseas Forces. This post, held by Sir John French in 1914, had been revived as another proof that Britain meant to stand by her continental guarantees and by her allies. Thus Sir Edmund was virtually given command of those forces which were to form Britain's expeditionary army, and assumed the duties of supreme liaison officer with the military commanders of Britain's allies.

With the declaration of war last September, Sir Edmund moved to the top of England's military hierarchy. Elevated to Chief of the Imperial General Staff, he replaced General Viscount Gort who went to France as commander of the forces in the field. Gort, by two years Ironside's junior, had come to the fore in the same Belisha house cleaning to which Ironside owed his advancement. Upon the declaration of war, Ironside and his brindled bulldogs moved into the War Office; Gort, his friend, established his headquarters "somewhere in France." The smooth transfer of an

HOW THEY RANK IN ENGLAND

Here is a comparative table showing officers of equivalent ranks in the three Services:

Royal Navy	*Army*	*Royal Air Force*
Admiral of the Fleet	Field Marshal	Marshal of the Royal Air Force
Admiral	General	Air Chief Marshal
Vice-Admiral	Lieutenant-General	Air Marshal
Rear-Admiral	Major-General	Air Vice-Marshal
Commodore	Brigadier or Colonel Commandant	Air Commodore
Captain	Colonel	Group Captain
Commander	Lieutenant-Colonel	Wing Commander
Lieut.-Commander	Major	Squadron Leader
Lieutenant	Captain	Flight Lieutenant
Sub-Lieutenant and Commissioned Warrant Officer	Lieutenant	Flying Officer or Observation Officer
Midshipman and Warrant Officer	Second Lieutenant	Pilot Officer

—The Star, *London.*

expeditionary force of 200,000 men across the channel and to the French front is a feat for which Ironside and Gort can share honors.

Sir Edmund owed much to Belisha's new broom. The two men stood by each other when the army staged its fight for the control of the air-arm. With the exception of the Expeditionary Forces' small air-component under the command of Viscount Gort, the bulk of the Royal Air Force

in France has been placed under Air Vice Marshal Playfair and thus under the Authority of Sir Kingsley Wood's Air Ministry. The army emerged victorious from this inter-departmental struggle. But the strain of a few months of close collaboration had begun to tell on the relationship of two men who are, in fact, born autocrats. The General may have felt his authority undercut by the Minister, and the not unusual frictions between soldier and politician may have arisen.

Hore-Belisha revealed little of what happened behind the scenes, and Sir Edmund also held his peace. But few observers doubted that there had been a scrimmage at the War Ministry and that Sir Edmund had come out on top. Eventually, Prime Minister Chamberlain transferred mild Oliver Stanley from the Board of Trade to the War Ministry, and thus conferred upon a more pliable individual the hard task of impersonating Sir Edmund's official superior.

A FEW weeks after the declaration of war last September, Ironside, who had spent the better part of his life in far off parts, had become a familiar figure to the English public. The bright lights of publicity were cast not only on the General's own important person, but also on the handsome members of his family. In 1915, Ironside had taken a week's leave between two offensives to marry Mariot Isobel Chayne. This marriage has been a happy one. Lady Ironside has dignity, good looks and humor.

Their daughter Elspeth, blond and twenty, is a much photographed member of the Wats (Women's Auxiliary Territorial Service). Their son, fifteen year old Master Edmund Ironside, recently visited French Headquarters, upon General Gustave Gamelin's invitation. The occasion: his father's decoration with the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor. The aftermath: an angry exchange in the House of Commons where members questioned the wisdom of extending such unheard-of-privilege to a minor and a civilian. Young Edmund, upon his return from his controversial visit to the army in the field, assured reporters that he still wished to join the navy.

Ironside spends his rare moments of leisure at a small cottage at Hingham, Norfolk. This is the family's English home. There the General's horses are kept. In years gone by, Ironside has greatly enjoyed riding to hounds. While he never has excelled at sports, he loves fox-hunting and fine jumping horses. In the hunting field, the massive General on a still more massive hunter, cuts an impressive figure. But his disrespectful fellow huntsmen were wont to cry, "Here comes the tank," when Sir Edmund hove into view astride his sturdy steed.

What are Ironside's views on warfare? What is the slant of mind England's most influential soldier brings to the planning of imperial strategy? His book, *Tannenberg*, a study of von Hindenburg's brilliant victory over the invading Russian armies at the Masurian Lakes, pays tribute to those strategic maxims which were laid down by the elder Moltke and by von Schlieffen. Their doctrine is essentially that of the war of motion and of the thrusts against the enemy's flanks and rear. Von Hindenburg's battle, in Ironside's appraisal, appears as a masterpiece of this German school of thought imbued with the spirit of the offensive. Ironside personally knows some of Germany's past and present army leaders. While their theories may not be his own, he is well acquainted with the German military mind.

Out of the summary of his career one fact emerges: his experience ranges over more battlefields than that of any other active British soldier. The recapitulation of Ironside's campaigns reads like a list of tomorrow's possible theaters of war. He has held during the World War independent command of men in France, in the Arctic, in the Near East, in India; he is a veteran of the diplomatic struggles and of the intrigues which attended Britain's dealings with early Soviet Russia, with Kemalist Turkey and the buffer states of the Middle East—and his rich experiences are deepened by the knowledge of other peoples which comes only to the accomplished linguist.

IN a series of lectures, delivered without notes before the London University in 1936, he outlined "Forty Years of Army Change and Development." To a spellbound audience the man of action revealed himself as a historian and master of the spoken word. Some of his sayings are well worth quoting: "The thing which is too often forgotten by people who make treaties is that it is no longer the question of a regular army going to war and doing what it is told to do. It is also a question of whether a people will fight." And: "Do not blame the stupid general too much. Remember that soldiers cannot learn their trade in peacetime." On tactics he has this to say: "One of the greatest tactical problems of today is how to cover the last seventy yards to the enemy's position." But his thoughts

range further afield. He does not mince words when speaking his mind on what is wrong with England. "The trouble with England is that it is either all beauty spot or congested area."

Ironside would not have grown into the legend which he has become were he not a leader of men. In this tall veteran of many campaigns, with his pipes and his bulldogs, there is a grizzled strength which inspires confidence in fighting men. To England, Ironside is the man of action who gets things done and many Englishmen have grown impatient with pussy-

(Continued on page 62)

B'nai B'rith

In its service to all races and creeds this Jewish organization is a benefactor of mankind

DR. ABRAM L. SACHER

NOT long ago, the Executive Committee of B'nai B'rith, America's oldest and largest national Jewish organization, held its 97th annual meeting. It received reports from all of B'nai B'rith's departments—reports of its impressive social service projects, of its rapidly expanding cultural and religious work in colleges and universities, of its new bureau of vocational guidance, of its battle against subversive movements which threaten the integrity of Jewish life, of its increasing membership in the United States, and of the destruction of nearly 150 units in totalitarian lands. It adopted a budget of more than a million dollars to continue and amplify its philanthropic, defense, and cultural services. Before adjournment, it made arrangements for the celebration of the centenary of B'nai B'rith which occurs in 1943.

All this was a far cry from the scarcely noticed day in October of 1843 when a dozen Jews of German origin, headed by one Henry Jones, met in New York City to create a fraternity "to unite Israelites in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity." At that time, there were scarcely fifteen thousand Jews in the United States. The mighty waves of immigration from Eastern and Central Europe had not begun and America was not yet the main hope of the weary and heavy laden. The new Order, named B'nai B'rith (Hebrew words meaning "Sons of the Covenant"), was little different from scores of similar agencies which took pride in secret symbols, bizarre uniforms and ritual.

After the middle of the century the axis of Jewish life moved steadily from the Old World to the New. As the opportunities for unfettered living disappeared in most European countries, the Jews, along with other depressed groups, came to these shores in legions. They came as

Henry Monsky of Omaha who is President of B'nai B'rith

"forty-eighters" after the abortive revolutions in the German states. They came from obscurantist Russia to escape the May Laws of 1881, the pogroms of the nineties, and the terror which followed the failure of the liberal Duma movement of 1905. In thousands, in tens of thousands, finally in amazing waves of hundreds of thousands, they poured gratefully, gladly, excitedly, into the United States, the new Promised Land. The Statue of Liberty welcomed them in Emma Lazarus' words, carved at its base:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.

As Europe swept towards the abyss of total war America became the hub of Jewish life, with a Jewish population of more than four millions.

Through all of these vast changes B'nai B'rith kept pace, widening and deepening its objectives, spreading through every part of the United States. It began with a few lodges along the eastern seaboard. As immigration expanded, the units multiplied until there were nearly five hundred in the United States, representing about 100,000 families or approximately half a million Jews. In the past decade, hundreds of women's auxiliaries and junior groups also have grown up, functioning under the supervision of B'nai B'rith men. Today there is no city of substantial Jewish population without its lodge. In many smaller communities there are instances where every single Jewish family is represented in B'nai B'rith. Until the rise of Hitler there were also about 150 lodges in other sections of the world, as far apart as China and South Africa, Palestine and the Argentine. The lodges of Greater Germany, Poland and Rumania have now been liquidated by government decree, together with Masonic groups and such service organizations as Rotary.

B'nai B'rith has not functioned on the Birth Standard or on the Gold Standard. Membership is drawn from every economic and social stratum. Originally, it was primarily German in its fabric, but the membership steadily broadened with the newer tides of immigration and B'nai B'rith now represents a genuine cross section of American Israel—German, Russian, Polish, and Rumanian, rich and poor, Zionist and non-Zionist, rabbi and layman, conservative and radical, believer and free-thinker. This membership is promised nothing except the opportunity to serve in the causes which political and economic changes in successive generations make important. By the end of the nineteenth century, its record of achievement gave B'nai B'rith a unique position in American life, a record warmly commended by all of the Presidents of the United States since the first Roosevelt.

Until the World War, the main efforts of B'nai B'rith were directed into philanthropic channels, into building and maintaining orphanages, old folks' homes, hospitals, infirmaries, and clinics. These have included the Children's Home of New Orleans (1855); Touro Infirmary of New Orleans (1875); Jewish Orphan Home of Atlanta (1889); Home for the Aged at Yonkers, N. Y. (1880); B'nai B'rith Orphanage at Erie, Pennsylvania (1914); and the B'nai B'rith Home for the Aged at Memphis, Tenn. (1927). But the most important of the philanthropic institutions are located in Cleveland, Denver and Hot Springs.

THE Cleveland Orphan Home, which was founded in 1868, was a pioneer in its field, constantly improving its technique to conform with changing sociological trends. The Home maintains an average of about 225 children, and approximately 5,000 youngsters have been cared for since its founding. Its present quarters, surrounded by spacious lawns and gardens, have the appearance of a lovely college campus, with comfortable brick homes, each housing a small group of children. Each home has its own cottage mother.

Today hundreds of the Cleveland Orphan Home's alumni, scattered through the country, occupy positions of authority and leadership, and remember with gratitude the Home which provided love and opportunity when they were sorely needed. Indeed, Alumni Hall, center of the social and recreational life of the campus, was the $150,000 gift of the graduates. The alumni include men of the caliber of I. S. Anoff, President of the Albert Pick Company in Chicago; Dr. Edward Calisch, Rabbi of Temple Beth Adabah in Richmond, Virginia; Samuel T. Lawton, Brigadier-General in the Illinois National Guard, and Joseph Weinberg, President of the Cleveland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

The Denver Jewish Hospital for Consumptives, founded in 1899, has also been a B'nai B'rith protégé. It has cared for more than 25,000 men, women and children who have come from every state in the union and represent all religious creeds. More than $10,000,000 has been spent for maintenance, and not one penny of this has come from the patients. For the motto of the hospital, lettered over an arch, is, "None may enter who can pay—none can pay who enter." In recent years the hospital's research department has made several notable contributions in the battle against the great white plague. The late Dr. I. B. Bronfin, former Medical Director of the Hospital, won wide acclaim for his experiments with a tuberculosis serum.

BORN in New York in 1899 and educated at Washington and Harvard Universities, Dr. Sacher received a Ph. D. for three years' post graduate research from the University of Cambridge, England. In 1923 he joined the faculty of the University of Illinois, resigning in 1929 to become the National Director of the Hillel Foundations. Widely travelled in Europe and the Far East, Dr. Sacher has written extensively for American magazines and is the author of "A History of the Jews" and "Sufferance Is the Badge." As a lecturer he has appeared in every large city in the country. For four successive years he was voted first preference at the Sinai Forum, Chicago.

The Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital, founded in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1914, was established to care for patients of all creeds and races who have sought the healing waters of the area. Non-Jews have usually outnumbered the Jews among the 12,000 who have come annually to the hospital and its social welfare station for assistance and relief. A large proportion have been Negroes.

All of the orphanages, hospitals and clinics have been maintained through membership dues and voluntary contributions. In a world of war and chauvinism, B'nai B'rith has modestly operated on the principle that it is more blessed to prepare hospitals for people than people for hospitals.

Before the World War, B'nai B'rith was also vitally interested in utilizing diplomacy to protect the integrity of European Jewish communities. In 1851 it appealed effectively to Secretary of State Daniel Webster against a proposed treaty with Switzerland which recognized limitations on the rights of Jews in certain Swiss cantons. Rumanian intolerance in the Seventies led to an appeal to President Grant, who despatched Benjamin Peixotto, one of B'nai B'rith's chief officers, as American consul in Bucharest. Peixotto's ministry ultimately brought about a modification of Rumania's policy towards its Jewish subjects. When Nicholas II of Russia refused to recognize American passports if they were carried by Jews, B'nai B'rith fought for abrogation of our trade treaty with Russia. President Taft afterwards sent to Adolph Kraus, then head of B'nai Brith, the pen with which the treaty was annulled.

Inability to become adjusted to change is a serious danger to well established organizations. B'nai B'rith has not suffered from this institutional disease. Its early objectives emphasized fraternalism and special benefits. When the needs of the times called for a broader program, B'nai B'rith established orphanages, asylums, old age retreats and a far flung network of social service institutions. Then other agencies, civic bodies and welfare funds stepped in, better equipped to take over these activities. B'nai B'rith gladly relinquished its leadership in the field in which it had pioneered. Its philanthropic program is still impressive but it is no longer *fundamental*. The largest portion of its budget is now expended for a new group of activities, especially important to meet the challenges of our times.

THE most pressing recent task has been associated with defense. Minority groups nearly always suffer from the popular dislike of the unlike. Usually they require special defense techniques to dissipate misconceptions about them which tend to breed group friction. To meet this need the Anti-Defamation League was established by B'nai B'rith about twenty-five years ago upon the suggestion of Sigmund Livinston, distinguished Chicago attorney. The League undertook the responsibility of clearing the stage and the screen, the school and the press, of material that defames Jewish character and personality. The old vaudeville comedian, with his vulgar witticisms at the expense of Jewish life, was gradually eliminated. The movies, a propaganda vehicle of amazing effectiveness, were taught the dangers of creating stereotypes which jeopardized religion and racial amity. Thousands of schools and colleges were persuaded, in the interest of good will, to

search the curriculum to remove text material which could easily poison the minds of children and adolescents. The long, patient battle against prejudice and exploitation gave the League a world of valuable experience. It became excellent preparation for the supreme task of our own day, the task of battling the most powerfully organized anti-Semitic onslaughts of modern history.

EUROPE has become a hell house for millions of Jews who have been specially singled out for attack. Bigotry has been buttressed by the sinister cunning of well-placed men who use anti-Semitism as a lightning rod to divert legitimate social protest. Unfortunately the United States is not completely free of the disease.

A minority of un-American politicians, hungry for the spoils of office, consider it good politics to discredit their opponents not by honest arguments, but by assertions that they are permeated with "Jewish" influence and are "taking dictation from the Jews." Again, the Nazi regime, anxious to build up a more favorable public opinion in America, sends skillful agents here who paint a roseate picture of the new Reich and stigmatize all adverse reports as the work of the international Jews, "the tapeworms of civilization."

How is one to fight back against such a nameless terror? A misinformed individual, the victim of a narrow upbringing, can be reasoned with. Religious prejudices may be dissipated by education; social prejudices may be mitigated by wider understanding. But here is a powerful phantom, that skulks behind "Christian" names, and "patriotic" slogans, that does not come into the open, that wraps itself in flags and racial theories, that spreads its network across frontiers and boundaries, that spares no expense, that stoops to every artifice, and that is not amenable to reason or pity. Such a terror, the product of modern conditions, strengthened by modern resources, can be fought only through efficiently organized battle. Its perpetrators must be tracked down, their methods analyzed, their set-up exposed.

For some time the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has been primarily concerned with this new terror. Carefully, expertly, making certain of its facts, it has been patiently collecting data and fighting back. It has not functioned through mass meetings. It has not whipped up popular hysteria. It has not sought to destroy its enemies by indignation parades. It has utilized the experience and the technique of twenty-five years of service. It has operated through trained representatives in more than five hundred American communities. Its central office, efficiently organized, has served as a clearing house where the isolated experiences of individuals and communities are sifted, analyzed, investigated, where trends are studied and proper perspective is gained. It cooperates with the leading church and civic groups in presenting the "American Way."

One example of the League's recent experiences may be interesting. Many minority groups in the United States —Italian, Polish, German and Ukrainian—have been deluged with anti-Semitic propaganda. Their foreign language press often has lacked the specialized information necessary to cope with the canards and the lies which have come in from abroad. The League, through its research department, has willingly cooperated in presenting factual material to counteract propaganda intended to stimulate racial and religious friction.

The League operates on the principle that when it serves to protect Jews from the attacks of the termites in the American household it serves America as well. For when it unmasks fraud, when it exposes the lies of propagandists, when it fights back against forces that seek to set group against group and class against class —when it does all of this through the democratic method of appealing to the fair play of Americans, it is helping to build a sounder national life. In this sense, it is more than an instrument to protect a minority. It is a useful force which cooperates with the best known and best respected Christian agencies in keeping the American people faithful to the finest traditions of Americanism.

THE HILLEL SET-UP

FOUNDATIONS

University	*Location*	*Approx. number Jewish students*
Illinois	Champaign	1200
Wisconsin	Madison	1000
Ohio State	Columbus	1100
Michigan	Ann Arbor	1400
California	Berkeley	1000
Cornell	Ithaca, N. Y.	800
Texas	Austin	500
Northwestern	Evanston, Ill.	700
Alabama	Tuscaloosa	400
Penn State	Penn State, Pa.	550
North Carolina	Chapel Hill	375
Indiana	Bloomington	300

EXTENSION UNITS

University	*Location*	*Approx. number Jewish students*
Missouri	Columbia	400
Ohio U.	Athens	250
Purdue	Lafayette, Ind.	100
Bucknell	Lewisburg, Pa.	50
Franklin-Marshall	Lancaster, Pa.	100
West Virginia	Morgantown	100
Florida	Gainesville	175
Georgia	Athens	150
Virginia	Charlottesville	300
Maryland	College Park	400
Duke	Durham, N. C.	100
Chicago	Chicago, Ill.	1200
Michigan State	East Lansing	225
Iowa	Iowa City	250
Michigan State Normal	Ypsilanti	50
Ala. Polytech.	Auburn	30
Miss. State	Starkville	50
Texas A. & M.	College Station	75

Colleges served: 30
Students served: 12,325

EQUALLY important among the new agencies of B'nai B'rith are the widely scattered Hillel Foundations. Today they serve nearly fifteen thousand Jewish students on thirty American campuses.

The Foundation technique was originally devised by Christian denominations which established student centers, supervised by professionally trained directors. They recognized that students who are away from their homes require guidance when their intellectual and religious standards are in flux. Disciplined in the colleges to understand their sectarian responsibilities, the young charges of the Christian denominations returned home prepared to take over leadership in churches, philanthropies and other outstanding Christian institutions.

Curiously enough it was mainly

Tributes from American Presidents

The last seven Presidents, starting with Theodore Roosevelt, have heartily endorsed the work of B'nai B'rith. These are the statements of ex-President Herbert Hoover and President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"It is a pleasure to bear witness to the hign ideals of public service that animate B'nai B'rith, and to the practical intelligence with which its broad policies of social service in the philanthropy are carried into execution. Its usefulness, not only in the United States, but also in Europe and the Near East, is everywhere recognized with gratitude; while in this country I would especially commend its example in working for mutual magnanimity, understanding and co-operation between all races and creeds."—*Herbert C. Hoover.*

"For almost a century B'nai B'rith has effectively served the well-being of American Jewry and the nation. Its philanthropic achievements are permanently enshrined within the walls of hospitals, orphanages, and homes for the aged which bless humanity in every section of our land. Its endeavors in the realm of education exhibit a far-sighted understanding in the problems of the younger generation. No less important is B'nai B'rith's program of Americanism, which fortifies the effort to keep America safe for democracy, while its program of good will strives toward harmony among the component elements comprising our American society."—*Franklin D. Roosevelt.*

through pressure from a distinguished Christian professor that the Hillel Foundations came into being. Eighteen years ago the Professor of Biblical Literature at the University of Illinois, Edward Chauncey Baldwin, was invited to address the Rabbinical Association in Chicago. The business part of the meeting, which preceded the address, concerned Jewish chaplains in the Illinois institutions. Which rabbi, that year, was to serve the inmates of the insane asylum in Kankakee? Who would minister to the Jewish prisoners in Joliet? When the discussion was over, Dr. Baldwin threw aside his prepared address and talked about the four hundred Jewish students who were then registered at the University of Illinois. There seemed to be much concern over a few unfortunate Jewish inmates in the state penitentiary, he said. But there was no guidance at all for healthy, normal Jewish students. "Many of them," Dr. Baldwin continued, "take courses from me in Biblical literature. I am ashamed because they know so little about the Scriptures which their own forbears created!"

Next year, through the initiative of public spirited men in Champaign and Chicago, the first Hillel Foundation was established at the University of Illinois. It was placed under the direction of a young rabbi, Benjamin Frankel, whose genius converted the dream of Professor Baldwin into a practical reality. Soon after, B'nai B'rith took the project under its wing. Since 1923, twelve units have been organized in leading universities. Last summer an extension program carried the Foundation technique into eighteen smaller colleges, and present plans call for the expansion into fifty more college and university centers.

A Hillel Foundation is a democratic institution, governed by a student council elected by the Jewish student body. The council plans all activities under the supervision of the director, who is usually a rabbi. The program includes classes, religious services, discussion groups and socials. At Illinois the Foundation courses, which are credited by the University, have developed into the most extensive program of religious education in the country. The Foundations also sponsor loan funds for needy students, employment and housing service, vocational guidance and a refugee program.

During the year which marked the inception of the Hillel Foundations another vital Jewish youth movement came into being, the Aleph Zedik Aleph (A.Z.A.). This organization, conducted by B'nai B'rith, offers adolescents, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, a five-point program which embraces religious, cultural and social service activities, as well as fellowship and athletics. In the sixteen years since its creation by a young native of Omaha, Sam Beber, it has expanded into three hundred and fifty units in the United States, with thousands of members and alumni. A.Z.A. meetings are held weekly under trained leadership.

The most recent department established by B'nai B'rith deals with vocational service. It was organized to stimulate community leadership to offer guidance to Jewish youngsters in the difficult choice of a career. Too many of them have been lured by the glamour of law and medicine and chemistry who may be equally or better qualified for other professions or occupations. The department functions mainly through regional vocational clinics.

OTHER activities of B'nai B'rith, important in terms of national service, may be briefly noted. For example, fifty cents, from the annual membership dues of twelve dollars, is set apart for an emergency fund. Whenever disaster falls in any part of the world, B'nai B'rith is among the first to respond. It may be a hurricane in Florida, an appeal for medical aid in Czecho-Slovakia, a tornado in Ohio, a typhoon in Japan, an earthquake in California, or Polish or Finnish relief.

The executive committee acts after a referendum by telegraph, and the relief funds are promptly wired or cabled. There is no distinction in terms of race or creed.

B'nai B'rith has also been vitally concerned with a program of Americanism, sponsoring patriotic exercises, encouraging research in American history, teaching recent immigrants to understand the blessings of American life, cooperating with other religious and civic groups in strengthening the American way in fighting back against the dogmas of Communism, Fascism and Nazism.

The only statue in the United States which is dedicated to religious liberty is a gift of B'nai B'rith. At the 1874 B'nai B'rith convention it was determined to participate in the Philadelphia centennial exposition by offering an appropriate gift to the American people. B'nai B'rith engaged young Moses Ezekiel, a veteran of the Confederate army (he was later knighted by Queen Victoria and is buried in Arlington Cemetery at the foot of the Confederate War Memorial which he designed), to fashion a statue emblematic of religious liberty. It was dedicated on Thanksgiving Day, 1876, and now stands in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia. On the front of the pedestal is the extract from the Constitution of the United States, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establish-

(Continued on page 60)

Yellow Peril

One of our gravest financial problems is what to do with Uncle Sam's buried gold

S. F. PORTER

UNCLE SAM has the Midas touch. His food turns to gold, whenever he ships it abroad. So do the typewriters, the airplanes, the gasoline and the cotton we export. Just as fast as the Africans and the Russians in Siberia can dig gold out of the ground it comes to us. We bury it right back in the ground again. We cannot use the stuff any more than could Midas, and it may turn out to be almost as great a plague to us.

We have about $18,000,000,000 in gold. That is four times as much gold as the Treasury owned a mere six years ago. The *increase* in six years is more gold than all the world had been able to accumulate for monetary use in the twenty centuries preceding. It is 60 per cent of all the known gold reserves in the world. It is enough gold to replace with gold coins every piece of paper money in circulation both in the United States and in Europe.

And we're going to get more. For the duration of Europe's war, and probably for a long time thereafter, most of the new-mined gold in the world will come straight to us. Because for each and every ounce of it that is offered, the U.S. Treasury will pay $35. The "35" is important, but so is the "$": We take gold and pay for it with what foreigners think is the safest money in the world.

The Treasury doesn't want any more gold. What to do? Refuse to buy any more? Reduce the price? Lend the gold to other nations? Put it back into circulation as coinage?

These are the solutions suggested. Every one of them has been considered by the Treasury and Federal Reserve experts. Every one of them is either futile or threatens consequences more frightening than to go ahead as we're going. Yet if the government continues its present policy, it is probable we shall fairly soon have nearly all the gold in the world. Already the huge pile of bars is useless to us. Suppose the other nations should say, "All right, you keep the stuff and see what good it does you. From this day forth, gold is no longer money. We will not accept it." Overnight, our hoard would become not merely useless but virtually worthless.

We have a bear by the tail.

Let's see how we got hold of it. There was a depression . . . remember? In its blackest days, people were storming the banks, demanding gold for their money, and hiding the coins in coffee cans and safe deposit boxes, or shipping them abroad. It looked as if the American dollar might presently have nothing behind it save the government's bare promise to pay. So we "went off the gold standard," which means that the government would no longer pay out gold for currency. As another step, shipments of gold abroad were forbidden and possession of gold was made unlawful. This stopped the drain on our gold reserves.

For decades, the Treasury had stood ready to give $20.67 in United States money for every ounce of gold anyone cared to offer, and to sell gold at the same price whenever anyone pushed currency across the counter. But now, refusing to sell gold, it began to buy the metal at higher and higher prices. The Treasury finally pegged the price at $35 an ounce.

The idea was to raise the prices of goods here at home, but to lower them abroad so that foreigners could afford to buy our exports. Just before we began bidding up the price of gold, the Britisher, for example, could get only $3.20 worth of goods for his pound note. But when we announced that a dollar would be one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold instead of about one twentieth, he could get $5 worth of goods for a pound sterling. The Treasury fixed upon $35 as the price of gold probably because this brought the pound, the money our best customer used, back to its traditional value in dollars.

ENTHUSIASTIC theoreticians had been sure that devaluing the dollar would restore prosperity almost overnight. It did nothing of the sort. Whether the move was nevertheless necessary because it staved off further collapse of prices in America and did help turn the corner will be debated by the experts for years to come, as will also the question of whether the price we set on gold was too high. Those who think so are probably in the majority, but almost as many think that, with Europe again at war, the gold would have come here anyway, for safety, for buying war supplies, for other reasons of trade whether we raised the price or not.

At any rate, repercussions of our policy were felt all over the world.

South African mines are the greatest producers of gold. They began mining lean ores that were unprofitable before. Canada's story is much the same. Russian production climbed

amazingly. And most of the new gold came here. To give an idea of the mining boom set off by the devaluation of currencies: the value of the gold produced in 1939 was greater than the entire monetary gold stock in existence in 1850. It was, to be precise, $1,400,000,000. But in 1939 we bought $3,574,414,000 of gold. Where did the difference come from?

PART of it from frightened Europeans, converting their assets into gold and shipping the metal here for safety. With gathering war clouds, governments sold gold here for dollars and held the dollars ready for vast purchase of airplanes, chemicals, steel—war supplies. Under our neutrality legislation, they must pay cash for goods. They've been accumulating the cash here. There has even been gold coming out of India from hoards untapped for centuries.

And as the capstone, the farmers and manufacturers of America have sold abroad since 1934 commodities worth $2,000,000,000 more than the total of goods we have imported, and that balance has been settled by shipping us gold.

Almost every liner that has docked in our harbors has been met by guards and armored trucks to carry away stocks of gold bars worth $14,000 apiece. All gold entering the country must be sold to the Treasury. Then it is usually sent straight off to Fort Knox, Kentucky. Into that guarded citadel, surrounded by water-filled moats, no man may ever walk alone. Always there must be two—one to watch the other. No one man knows the combination to the steel door that is a yard thick and weighs twenty tons. It takes two men to open it. Armed soldiers pace their measured beats, day and night, above the greatest treasure ever gathered together in one place in all the history of the world. Buried treasure. And dangerous.

Excessive gold stores have been known to explode into the unhealthiest of speculative booms. The gunpowder that explodes a boom is cheap and abundant credit. The spark is the speculative fever. So far, the spark has been lacking, but there never in all history was such a potential supply of bank credit. For the amount of money the banks can lend is in direct ratio to the gold reserve. On a gold base of some $4,000,000,000 we had the wild boom of the late '20's. What kind of show might we stage with a gold base of $18,000,000,000? True, the government has tried to install a set of brakes. The amount of reserves the banks must carry against deposits has been increased. New laws make it harder now to speculate in stocks—harder, but not impossible.

Lurking always in the background, too, is the fear that sooner or later the gold stock may be used for a monetary inflation. It would be a way of cutting the annual deficit, and of avoiding the $45,000,000,000 national debt limit. Simply issue currency against the gold. The law prescribes that the gold reserve behind our currency shall be 40 per cent. At present, currency outstanding is some seven billions of dollars. Thus instead of our gold being 40 per cent of our currency, our paper money is less than 40 per cent of our gold. The classic pattern of an inflation is a flood of paper money with nothing to back it. "Inflation" covered, say 100 per cent, by gold would be something new in the world and its consequences unpredictable.

In summary, then, we are exchanging our good wheat and cotton and machinery for something we don't want, can't use and are afraid of. What's to be done?

I've interviewed the recognized authorities. The bigger the man, the less sure is he of the answer. It has been suggested that we might stop the incoming flood by reducing the price we'll pay for gold. That would chalk up a staggering loss on the Treasury's present gold stock, but that might be disregarded as mere bookkeeping if the move would rectify the situation. The real terror to be faced is that it would probably send prices spiraling downward—dollar prices, that is—and touch off a new depression.

A SECOND suggestion is that we might stop buying gold altogether. That would have all the bad effects of cutting the price, and a worse one on top of them, for there would be no

World Gold Reserves: Each Symbol Represents 1 Billion Dollars of Gold Content

common denominator in which to carry on international trade.

Whether on the gold standard or not, the value of the money of every country in the world is measured against gold. The Brazilian who sells coffee to Rumania knows that so many Rumanian lei are worth a dollar, which is to say, one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold, and a dollar in turn is worth so many Brazilian milreis. But if there is no international standard against which he can measure, he hasn't the faintest idea what price he is getting for his coffee. Moreover there is no mechanism for getting paid at all if the money of Rumania cannot be converted into Brazilian money through some gold currency. The only way to carry on business under such conditions is through barter. Germany has been the perfect illustration of a country with a money which has no ascertainable gold value. The result is that nobody outside Germany wants marks.

Fitzpatrick—St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Looks Like a White Elephant

SINCE the dollar is now the only important monetary unit with fixed gold value, the whole financial world would be thrown into chaos were we to refuse to exchange the dollar for gold when gold is offered us.

"Put gold back into circulation," says another pundit. "Let us have gold coins again. The public will take billions of it away from the government vaults."

But the public could not possibly be expected to take—out of our buried $18,000,000,000—more than two or three billions to jingle in its pockets. Nor would this solution arrest continued gold imports or check additional production.

"Lend the gold," shouts an ever-increasing group of politicians and economists. "Lend it to South America, to any country whose friendship and trade we desire. Then they'll be able to buy our goods."

But that doesn't get us very far. International debts can only be paid in trade or in gold. The nations that might be able to use the money to develop new wealth with which to pay up, are few and small. And any debtor who could not pay his debt in trade would simply ship the gold back to us to meet his bills. This would leave us with the gold problem still on our hands and the borrower now owing us the amount of the loan.

In what we once were pleased to call a "normal" world, gold flowed back and forth between nations with the rise and ebb of international trade. As gold holdings increased in any country, they normally caused a rise in prices. Rising prices made that country's goods expensive to foreign purchasers, and exports fell off. Presently, the country was importing more goods than it exported, and settled the balance by exporting gold. But it seems inconceivable that the present situation can cure itself in the traditional manner. Europe and Asia, when they emerge from war, will not be able for a long time to produce any great volume of goods to be sold to us for gold. It is even more unlikely that our farmers and our manufacturers would tolerate a flood of imports to compete with domestic products.

Is there an answer? More and more men are asking that question, and turning away with fear. Will it end in our having practically all the world's gold and nothing to do with it?

But this bogey that the other nations of the world will declare gold no longer acceptable as money and leave us holding the bag is, I think, just a bogey. Man has the gold habit. It is thousands of years old. Dictators can outlaw gold in totalitarian states. It works—within their own borders. But when they import goods, they have to use gold or work out clumsy barter deals. Other states might try to declare gold a mere commodity, good only for filling teeth. But note carefully that the greatest producers of gold in the world are the British Empire and Russia. Great Britain will hardly demonetize gold when the move would ruin South Africa, deal a staggering blow to Canada. And money acceptable in the British Empire is very useful money, indeed, as all the South Americans and the small nations of Europe are sure to feel. For that matter, what substitute is possible?

THE underlying truth is, of course, that the gold problem is a symptom, not a disease. The problem is a sick world. Restore peace, prosperity and trade, and the gold problem will cure itself. It is not possible to do anything about gold that does not involve a host of other factors.

If capitalism survives, gold will continue to be synonymous with money. What the eventual adjustment will be, how America will fare, no one can foresee.

(Continued on page 61)

China Unbowed

Although suffering from hardship and humiliation, China continues the fight for peace with honor

MADAME CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Wife of the Chinese Generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek

WHEREVER the Japanese have been they have marked our land with ruin. They have left scars upon our earth, our hearts and our minds—indelible scars—scars which never can be healed or eradicated. I wonder if the Japanese people realize that? They should begin to do so quickly if they ever hope to recover any semblance of prestige, or even standing, in China—or in the world, for that matter. The myriad ghosts they have made will take a lot of laying—ghosts of men, women and children; of ancient cities, towns, and villages; of workshops and factories; of the little shops—the places of handicraft of the millions.

So far we, in China, have not had much opportunity to achieve any particular modernized national greatness. We have been having too much warfare since 1911 to have had the time to become even an acceptably passable republic. Perhaps we have been too content, in a way, to live upon the musty reputation of our ancient glory, with—as caustic critics may well describe them—intramural intellects pretending to competency in the handling of modern systems and devices. I have to say "intramural" because we are too big a country to be called provincial—and, also, we have a wall. Whatever we are, we have to admit that we found it difficult for many years to march fast toward national success, though we really had girded our loins, and had started, full of hope, when our progress was stopped by the aggression of the Japanese.

Our dilatoriness to date has really been largely due to the fact that our national characteristics never have been given a proper airing, or scrubbing, or dry cleaning; never have been pegged out on the line, so to speak. But there is one thing that I am devoutly hopeful about, and that is that the terror and the death and the burning that has been unceasingly inflicted upon us since July 7, 1937, will not have been in vain so far as a readjustment of both our national outlook and our international attitude is concerned. Were it all to be in vain it would be just as ghastly a catastrophe, in a way, as the one we are now enduring.

I have expressed the hope that we would tread the democratic path, but must mention that, while the desire to adhere to the democracies is pretty widespread and substantial at the moment, there is a school of thought developing which is asking with some impatience, but also with some pertinence: "What have the governments of the democracies done for us?"

That is, from their point of view, a natural and justified question. One has to admit that the governments of the democracies have done nothing tangible or practical, not even to protect their own interests. They fear, of course, that if they become too articulate just at present they may find themselves put in the position of having to defend their words with guns. Naturally, they do not want war, but if it has to come, they want to be ready for it.

Madame

While that attitude of mind is perfectly understandable, a large section of our thinking people cannot comprehend why the democratic governments still fear to express themselves in practical terms to Japan on the question of her infamies and inhumanities. After all, we seem to have been left frigidly alone by every democracy to fight as best as we can, with our inadequate equipment, for the principles which the democracies espouse—the sacredness of treaties and international laws, and all that—as well as for our own salvation. One disconcerting thing is that, though we have been deserted, as it were, the democracies seem to be willing to listen with a strangely attentive ear to the demands of Japan that the powers should remain neutral. Japan, with the air of a grievously injured innocent, is crying for help to destroy us as if it were her country that was being wrongly invaded and consumed by fire, and her people who were being blown to fragments by the guns of Chinese aggressors.

Those of our people who question the advisability of our keeping in with the democracies point out that it is the amazing studied neutrality of the democracies that enables Japan without any restraint to continue killing our people, violating our women, and making a wilderness of all of our territory that she has been able to penetrate.

It has taken China a long time to unify, a short time to show the strength and advantage of that unity. Hitherto, fear of Japan produced a sort of paralysis among us. Not a weakness peculiar to China, be it

said, for fear has done that to other countries too. But now that it has been proved in our civil and social arenas, no less than on our battlefields, that even the alleged invincibility of the Japanese can be countered with some success by concerted effort, we may expect that the intelligent among our people will hereafter be ashamed not to show good citizenship and energy and honesty in the forwarding of constructive and helpful reforms. If they do not—if too many of them are sluggards—I foresee the rise of forces that will be dangerous for them. The old apathy will never again be tolerated. China is bound to shed her worn-out gowns of indifference and laziness—celestially characteristic though they once may have been. The awakened minds of the present generation and the developing ones of the next will see to that.

Militarily, we have sustained ourselves and we will continue sustaining ourselves. The invaders, by virtue of their tremendous weight in equipment, may win battles, but they will be compelled to stick to the ruts of long lines of penetration, while we, if we have munitions, can move about our country as pieces are moved about the squares of a chessboard until we checkmate Japan and win the war.

I have received many letters from friends in America urging me to go there to assist in the raising of funds for our sufferers. Unhappily I cannot be in two places at the one time, and since America is renowned for its unbounded generosity and its virile reaction to suffering and injustice, I am inclined to believe that it is more important for me to stay and help here.

If the American people decide that the terrible wholesale butchery and burning and outraging that is being perpetrated by Japanese soldiers upon the Chinese people does not warrant their aid, then they will not give it; if many of them feel unmoved by the threat of catastrophe to the world if Japan defeats us, then nothing I can say will affect them one way or the other. If they know that we are fighting the battle of civilization against a revival of barbarism, while defending our heritage, and still do not wish to contribute to any relief fund, nothing I could do would change their hearts or minds.

We feel deeply grateful to all in America who have spontaneously given of their best to succor our distressed people. Friends have given liberally, some lavishly, of their time and their money to help us. Our everlasting appreciation goes out to them all, as it does to the many who have prayed for us, who have expressed sympathy for us, who have worked in movements for us, who have given practical demonstration of their feelings for us, and their realization of the menacing threat to the world that this aggression in China means, by boycotting all things Japanese. All we can give in return is a promise to try to continue the singlehanded struggle we have been engaged in, difficult and unequal as it is, for we know that if we do lose the whole world will lose, especially those nations which are now enjoying the freedom of democracy.

Calamity such as ours calls for special qualities if it is to be overcome successfully. Not only must we have the courage to face our enemy, but we must have the courage to face the hitherto peaceful and industrious population of region upon region being folded back upon us by relentless invasion and thus increasing our burdens as well as testing our capabilities and our patriotism.

Unhappily the impoverished Chinese millions will require more help than will be available in China. Organized help should come from governments abroad—not only from the sympathetic people—because of the danger of the loss of this great potential market. With the deliberate widespread ruin being inflicted by the Japanese, and with the loss of means of livelihood of the survivors in ravaged regions, there will be dire poverty. That will lead to complete loss of purchasing and producing power until the future restores normal conditions. Without return to production there can be no commerce, and no commerce will close China indefinitely to the trading people of foreign countries.

That is, of course, why Japan launched her relentless campaign and why Japanese officers and soldiers are deliberately encouraging looting of occupied territory. It is this criminal marauding, on a scale never before seen, or permitted by civilized nations, that is going to intensify Chinese poverty, cramp the world's commerce, and aggravate the difficulties of settling the masses of roaming refugees and finding means of subsistence for demobilized soldiers, unless something is done now by the governments of the democracies.

The tragedy of China, if she is unable to overcome the barbaric onslaught being made upon her, will be that she, alone of all nations, has survived many centuries of world upheavals, has triumphed over great natural calamities and internal wars, has successfully carried her culture and her civilization through the vicissitudes of countless generations, only to lose it now when civilization is supposed to be at its zenith, when the world is supposed to have long abandoned barbarism and duplicity and hedged itself in with wisely realistic treaties and laws so as to make the life of the individual, the community, and the nation peaceful, prosperous, and secure.

The Conquest of Cancer

Watchfulness, immediate medical advice and education are the principal guideposts in the detection of cancer

ISAAC F. MARCOSSON

Author of "Adventures in Interviewing," "Turbulent Years," etc., etc.

"DOCTOR, is it cancer?"

This is the fateful question asked many times every day in hospitals and doctors' consulting rooms throughout the United States. No other disease arouses such dreadful apprehension or, once it strikes, provokes such black despair. Cancer is an age-old scourge. It is the most democratic of all diseases, the victims ranging from kings to ditch-diggers. Happily, the fangs of this universal killer are being drawn. Out of the darkness which for centuries enshrouded cancer is emerging light, and with it hope for a considerable degree of emancipation. Since April has been set aside by Act of Congress as Cancer Control Month, it is opportune to present the main facts about a long-entrenched enemy of mankind.

Most people fail to realize the destruction wrought by Public Health Enemy Number Two, as cancer has been well designated. Only heart disease takes a larger toll of human life. Four hundred men, women, and children die from cancer in this country every day. This is three times the number of fatalities caused by automobiles. Approximately one out of eight people who reach the age of forty will die of the disease if the present rate of death continues. Based on lost earning power and productiveness, the annual cost to us, due to deaths from cancer, is $1,000,-000,000. At the time I write, 450,000 people are suffering from cancer in the United States.

Cancer constitutes the greatest existing challenge to medical research. Smallpox, diphtheria, and typhoid fever are preventable or curable through inoculation. There can be no such absolute cancer prevention for the reason that the cause of cancer is still not fully comprehended. Slowly, however, the mystery which envelops the source of the disease is being stripped away. The cancer research specialist is not altogether groping in the murk.

The physical menace of cancer is aggravated by a mental hazard. People are keen to talk about their operations but they become strangely silent when it comes to cancer. To a greater extent than prevails with any other disease, cancer has suffered from the curse of silence. The word itself is a leper in the common vocabulary. Until the campaign for cancer control brought the disease into the open, cancer was a taboo topic. Every one knew it existed but few dared to mention it. The idea that cancer is a disgraceful disease, touched with stigma, became widespread. Families implored physicians to keep the dread word off the death certificates of their lost ones. Even newspapers still touch the subject gingerly. If a well-known man dies of cancer you usually read that "he passed away after a long illness." When a well-known actress died of cancer in New York a few years ago the newspapers attributed her death to pneumonia. It had a less forbidding sound.

The greatest handicap on cancer control, and likewise the stoutest ally of cancer itself, is fear. Here is where that mental hazard comes in. With no other disease has the fear complex played such a devastating role. Everybody fears cancer because everybody is a potential victim. It follows that when people have the easily recognized symptoms of early cancer, they shy from going to a doctor for fear of being told that they have cancer. They wait until they have pain, and then it is often too late. One of the insidious things about cancer is that it is painless in the early stages. The lump on the breast, one of the indications of possible cancer, is a case in point. Only one out of ten such lumps is malignant. Yet most women who discover a lump on a breast fly into a panic, conceal the fact in the absurd belief that "it will go away," and pay for secrecy with their lives.

If you would take a poll on cancer in any group anywhere you would glean two unfailing answers. One is: "Cancer is incurable"; the other, "Cancer is contagious." The truth is that early cancer is curable and that cancer is not contagious. You can no more "catch" cancer than you can acquire the shape of some one's nose, or the color of his eyes. One of the great tasks of the cancer control crusader, therefore, is to sterilize the blind, almost paralyzing, fear that so often prevents early diagnosis and thus confutes cure.

Fortunately for the human race, the fear complex about cancer does not extend to the domain of research. Here the small army of devoted men and women in white, working in silent laboratories with their animal recruits for experimentation, wage the unsung war on cancer. The procedure is almost identical with the line of offensive that conquered diphtheria, smallpox and typhoid. These one-time scourges have now been reduced to almost negligible proportions. Malaria and tuberculosis are rapidly being brought under control.

The major objective of contemporary research is cancer. It means that the first step in the conquest is the winning of the physiological or biological sector, accomplished through

discovery of the nature of the disease, its cause and transmission.

No field of research is more difficult or more complicated than cancer. Since the disease is a disorderly growth of cells the problem involves fundamentals of growth and of life itself. The chemist, the biologist, the biochemist and the geneticist are only part of the force to be mobilized. The physicist, with his studies of the value of super-power X-rays and the effects of radium, is as necessary as the surgeon experimenting with a new operative technique, or the clinician testing new methods of treatment. This is why the ultimate discovery of the cause of cancer cannot be a one-man task.

There can be no *blitzkrieg* in the war on cancer. A lightning war aims only at destruction. The cancer conflict is aimed at human salvage. It must necessarily be slow and therefore long. Much that is heartening has been achieved.

Before we find out just what has been done it may be well to find out the basic facts concerning cancer. Cancer has been known since ancient times. The name is derived from a Latin word meaning "crab." The ancients believed that they saw a resemblance between the spreading of cancer and the extended claws of a crab. Cancer is not limited to man alone. It is found in all animal life. Many people have the idea that cancer prevails only among the middle-aged and the old. All ages are susceptible. Babies are born with it.

Each of us is composed of millions of tiny units called cells. During our early years these cells grow rapidly, multiplying and organizing into skin, bone, muscle and all that goes into the structure of the human body. As we approach maturity, this normal growth slows until it is limited to replacing tissue that has been worn out or injured. Cancer begins as a single, abnormal cell, or group of cells, which multiply rapidly and spread into adjacent tissues. Since cancer serves no useful purpose in the body it must be destroyed.

Despite the great progress in research, obscurity still masks the process by which a normal cell suddenly goes berserk and becomes a little gangster, as it were. It disregards the laws of the body precisely as a human gangster flouts the people's law. It grows into the malignant and deadly disease which is cancer.

Although mystery still envelops the major cause of cancer, various contributory reasons for this curse of humanity have been uncovered. Laboratory research on mice, rats and rabbits shows that two factors apparently are present in the beginning of the disease. One, often extraneous, is irritation; the other is an inherited susceptibility.

What is known as occupational cancer involves different causes of irritation. As early as the middle of the eighteenth century Percival Pott, an English surgeon, noted that chimney-sweeps frequently developed cancer of the skin. It became so prevalent among these workers that it was called "chimney-sweep cancer." The irritation, which caused this skin cancer, was due to the soot in the chimneys. The soot contained a large proportion of tar and pitch. Years later tar was to provide an invaluable aid to modern cancer research.

Another form of skin irritation that causes cancer is common in Kashmir in India. Because of the intense cold the natives carry a *kangri*, or basket of hot coals beneath their robes. The constant heat over a long period produced irritation which, in turn, caused cancer. This cancer is called *kangri*-cancer.

One of the most frequent types of occupational cancer is due to exposure to certain mineral oils. Skin cancer is abnormally frequent among workers in petroleum refineries. The oil formerly used to lubricate spinning machinery in the English cotton mills had the same effect. Skin cancer can also arise from occupational exposure to sun rays. Fishermen, farmers and others who work out-of-doors the year around are apt to develop cancer of the skin of the face. This need not be an argument against sun baths since moderate exposure is beneficial rather than otherwise. In this connnection is an interesting and little known fact.

A blonde is more likely to get cancer from excessive exposure to the sun than a brunette. This is because his or her skin is more sensitive.

Among the many myths relating to cancer is a belief that it is caused by eating tomatoes, drinking milk, excessive use of salt, using aluminum cooking utensils and electric refrigeration. It has been scientifically demonstrated beyond any doubt that these things have absolutely nothing to do with the cause of cancer.

Persons not engaged in the occupations that I have specified are subject to irritation that may develop cancer. Chronic irritation may be brought on by a jagged tooth which cuts the tongue, a shoe rasping a black mole, or incessant smoking of a clay pipe which affects the lips.

Occupational cancer provided the clue that led to a significant step in cancer research. Years ago a German physician observed the high incidence of skin cancer among workers with lignite tar in Saxony. Just about the same time it was noted in England that in many different vocations where the workers came into contact with tar, napthalene, phenol, creosote, oil, anthracene, or pitch, cancer of the skin and also of the bladder was prevalent. Obviously there was a close relation between coal tar and cancer.

Away off in Japan two native biologists read in a scientific paper about the high rate of cancer among European workers with tar. They decided to do something about it. Thereupon they began to smear the ears of rabbits with tar. With the persistency as well as the insatiate curiosity of their race, they stuck to the job. In two years they were able to produce cancer in rabbits' ears with tar. But this was only the beginning. There are hundreds of coal tar derivatives. The task was to break down these derivatives and find the specific ones that could produce synthetic cancer. Two great English cancer research specialists—Doctors Kennaway and Cook—succeeded in isolating coal tar derivatives with the result that today there are forty-five of these chemicals which precipitate cancer. Man could now produce the dread disease in animals. I have seen one of these chemicals—a yellow powder—injected into a chicken. Within two months the fowl had a full-fledged cancer of the breast.

The value of these chemicals in cancer research is incalculable. By producing cancer in mice, it has been

possible to get a line on animal cancer heredity. It has been found, for example, that cancer of the breast in a mouse is often reproduced in its offspring.

This reference to heredity brings us to a phase of human cancer that has caused a vast amount of needless alarm. Wherever a family has been desolated by a death from cancer, the survivors invariably become obsessed with the fear that the disease is hereditary. They ask in terror, "Who will be the next?" The belief that cancer is hereditary is almost as deep-seated as the fallacious idea that it is contagious and incurable.

Although laboratory research has shown that one of the causes of cancer in animals is susceptibility to the disease, it does not mean that a person whose parents have had cancer will inevitably have it. It does mean, however, that where parents or relatives have had the disease in a particular organ, the individual should be constantly on the alert for symptoms that might indicate the presence of cancer in the same organ. This is particularly true of cancer of the breast. Studies in heredity have proved that in human beings the processes and influences of heredity in causing cancer are so complex that it is unnecessary for the individual to consider it as a personal problem. Cancer seems to appear quite as frequently in those whose parents did not have cancer, as those who did. Summed up, cancer is not hereditary. People inherit a susceptibility to it in certain organs.

The creation of synthetic cancer with all its helpful and illuminating ramifications represents only one of the achievements of cancer research. We now know that cancer is not contagious or infectious, thus removing a long-felt fear. We also know that cancer is not born of a germ. Moreover, cancer is not a blood disease. There is no test of the blood that will reveal the presence of cancer except in rare types occurring in the male genital organs.

That cancer is not due to a germ is the best possible reason why people should never try to cure the disease with medicine. No known medicinal remedy is effective against cancer. It cannot be cured by injections, by serums, by pills or by electric belts. These alleged "remedies" are the palliatives of "quack" cancer doctors who thrive on tragedy and the gullibility of the unfortunate. Yearly they

EARLY is the Watchword in Cancer Control

WHEN TREATMENT BEGINS

EARLY

LATE

Cancer of the BREAST

Cancer of the WOMB

Cancer of the MOUTH

Cancer of the SKIN

Cancer of the RECTUM

Cancer of the BLADDER

or = CURABLE CASES

= INCURABLE CASES

EACH FULL SYMBOL REPRESENTS TWENTY PERCENT

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE CONTROL OF CANCER

spend millions for useless "cures." The only accredited and effective treatment for cancer is surgery, radium and X-rays, or a combination of these agencies.

The great progress in the treatment of cancer is due, of course, to clinical and laboratory research. It took years of experiment before the dosages used in X-rays and radium were standardized. While the million-volt machine is still in an experimental stage, industry has produced an effective X-ray instrument, costing about $50,000, that is being rapidly installed in many hospitals. Surgery, especially in cases of the larynx and the lung, has been notably improved in recent years. In diagnosis the use of the aspiration biopsy, by which, through a slender needle, bits of tissue are secured without pain or difficulty, has been perfected. A diagnostic test for tumors of the testes is another step forward. The flexible gastroscope, developed by Rudolph Schindler, enables the physician to look into the stomach, the organ where the highest percentage of cancer occurs. One of the achievements on the theoretical side of cancer research is the development of strains of laboratory animals, notably mice, in which the incidence of cancer can be predicted with uncanny accuracy. Through these animals a method of studying cancer from the genetic and biological angles has been evolved. By inbreeding, these strains have become as biologically pure as chemicals.

It has not been so very long since the doctor's almost invariable verdict in a case of cancer was: "It is incurable. All I can do is to relieve the pain with opiates."

Conditions have changed. The advance in research, surgery and radiation that I have indicated has set up a beacon to guide the feet of the cancer-ridden. In many thousands of cases it has been, and is being demonstrated, that cancer is curable in its early stages. It means that *when* a cancer is treated is more important

than *how* it is treated. The old fear that aided and abetted the disease is being replaced by knowledge. Knowledge, as we all know, is power. Nowhere is it more vital than in the domain, so long the land of deepening shadows, which is the confine of cancer.

If you are skeptical about the fact that cancer can be cured in its early stages then go with me on a little journey into a tiny world that has been brightened by the foresight and prompt surgical action which are the uncompromising foes of mankind's second most destructive enemy. It is a small, shingled house on a side street in the town of Milton, just outside Boston. Here lives Dr. Anna C. Palmer. Twenty years ago she was operated on for a cancer of the breast. Today at eighty-four she is spry and chipper. She does all her cooking and housework, lectures on cancer control, is Vice Commander of the cancer control unit in Massachusetts, and, more important perhaps than all this, is president of the Cancer Cured Club. I have never seen an octogenarian more alert than this animated evidence of what can be done to combat cancer if you take the precautions in time.

The Cancer Cured Club has a growing membership in every part of the United States. It is open to any one vouched for by his or her physician as having been cured of cancer for at least five years before the application for membership is filed.

When early cancer is surgically removed it is not likely to recur at all if there is no evidence of it after two years. The five-year period was set as a safety cycle. The only requirement for membership in the Cancer Cured Club, after the cure itself, is that the applicant subscribe to the statement: "I am willing to be known publicly as a cured cancer patient." Through this procedure a blow is struck at the ban of silence which has so long frustrated the dissemination of facts about cancer cases.

People are beginning to be less reluctant to talk about cancer. Unfortunately it is still regarded by many as touched with stigma despite the fact that some of the greatest of world figures—the list includes Napoleon Bonaparte, Gladstone, the second German Kaiser, President Grant, Sun Yat-sen and Grover Cleveland—had cancer.

The membership in the Cancer Cured Club is only part of the host of the cancer-emancipated. Eight years ago the American College of Surgeons began the preparation of what is perhaps the most effective of all human documents in support of the idea that cancer can be cured in its early stages. It conducted a symposium on "Cancer Is Curable," at the annual clinical congress in St. Louis. Thirty eminent surgeons, who had operated in some of the best-known hospitals in the United States, reported 8,840 cancer cures. By the end of 1938 the roster had grown to 29,195 people. Since that time the list has been greatly augmented.

This legion of the cancer redeemed —and thousands more are unrecorded—are alive because they did not yield to fear and superstition. They knew, or were told, the symptoms of cancer. They started treatment while the disease was still local. They did not wait for the pain which is the tragic signal that the cancer has spread. Then it is often too late.

The consequence of tardiness in treatment for cancer is shown by these figures: Seventy-five per cent of breast and mouth cancer cases are curable in the early stage, while only 20 per cent are curable under late treatment. Whereas 85 per cent of cases of cancer of the lip can be cured in the initial stage, only 10 per cent yield in late treatment. In cancer of the womb cases 80 per cent are curable if treated in time, while only 10 per cent are curable when treated late. The least formidable of cancer attacks—that is, on the skin—is curable in 95 per cent of the cases if prompt action is taken, while 30 per cent are curable when taken late.

It is just as important for people to know the symptoms of cancer as to be familiar with the principles of the Declaration of Independence. That great document made for political freedom and through it life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. By acting promptly on early symptoms of cancer a kindred physical freedom can be achieved and with it longer life and usefulness.

The cancer danger signals are: Any unusual lump or thickening, especially in the breast; any irregular bleeding or discharge from any body opening; any sore that does not heal —particularly about the tongue, mouth or lips; persistent indigestion, often accompanied by loss of weight; sudden changes in the form or rate of growth of a mole or wart.

The one and only insurance against cancer, or cancer fatality, is embodied in this list of "Four Things to Do," promulgated by the American Society for the Control of Cancer:

"(1) Watch for any possible symptom, and report to your physician at the suspicion of a condition which might result in cancer. If you cannot pay for care, ask your physician to advise how to secure free care.

"(2) Have a complete physical examination—one that covers all the sites where cancer is likely to develop —at least once a year.

"(3) Inform your family and friends regarding treatment that is now available for cancer. Warn them against consulting quacks with their dangerous and ineffective cures. Urge members of your family and others to report to a physician or a cancer clinic at the earliest possible moment when any condition resembling cancer, or suggestive of it, appears.

"(4) Talk sensibly and act sensibly about cancer. If cancer symptoms appear, there is no need for hysteria but there is need for reporting to a physician or a clinic immediately."

There is not the slightest reason why anyone anywhere in the United States should be ignorant of cancer symptoms. The growing campaign for cancer control, carried on by the American Society for the Control of Cancer, its Women's Field Army, and other allied groups, has spread the gospel of intensive cancer education. Cancer Control Month finds the Women's Field Army mobilized to full strength in forty-six States. From its mast-head flies the slogan: "Early Cancer Is Curable. Fight Cancer with Knowledge." This is the heartening message that devoted men and women are bringing to humanity. In Europe vast armies are girded for a war of destruction. In the United States the army of cancer control workers is dedicated to a war to save.

Almazan, Mexican Caballero

In Juan Andreu Almazan, presidential candidate, the Cardenas regime confronts formidable opposition

MICHAEL SCULLY

THERE is a cynical adage in Mexico that control of the government can be changed only by a revolution or a miracle. In all its history as a quasi-democracy, the country has never held a free and democratic election; no independent candidate has ever won at the polls.

But Juan Andreu Almazan believes he is a miracle man.

He resigned his command as senior general of the army to oppose General Manuel Ayila Camacho, the machine's choice to succeed President Cardenas. He drew 200,000 cheering listeners to the greatest demonstration Mexico City has seen in thirty years. In Camacho's home state, Puebla, he won the open support of the state federation of workers and peasants. He has split the ranks of union labor, once solidly behind Cardenas.

Such feats by a conservative candidate in the country we have come to know as "Red" Mexico have proved two significant points: That great bodies of Mexicans have been disillusioned by Cardenas' program, and that the government machine is not opposed this time by the traditional straw-man.

Should he win the presidency in July's balloting, Almazan might be the answer to a Pan-American prayer. He opposes the communistic influences which foster the anti-Yankee spirit in Mexico and are feared wholeheartedly by Latin governments to the south. The masses understand Almazan. He is the *Caballero*—the man on horseback whom Mexico has always known. The bewildered peon is psychologically ready to follow a *patron* who promises a way out of his dilemma in concrete, familiar terms.

More analytical supporters expect no lofty idealism; they see him as an intelligent "strong man" who would return the country to a moderate course without destroying the basic gains of the revolution—land for the

Almazan

peasants, guarantees for labor, broader educational and social opportunities. They believe, for instance, that without returning the oil lands he would work for a compromise to satisfy both the companies and national pride and, most important, assure capital of its future security.

Almazan makes Cardenas' administration the issue of the campaign. He ignores Camacho, his nominal opponent.

He describes himself as "profoundly nationalistic," but he says: "We can never have either the sympathy or cooperation of the American people to become a strong nation unless we establish bonds of true friendship with them. This must be based upon conscientious respect of our mutual rights."

That shaft is aimed at a long series of moves by Cardenas such as his recent unprovoked criticism of the Monroe Doctrine. In 1938, Washington agreed to buy 35,000,000 ounces of silver it didn't need in order to bolster the weak Mexican treasury. Cardenas almost immediately shot up import taxes to get additional revenue. The increases, some as high as 400 per cent, made in the face of the Hull low tariff resolutions to which Mexico had subscribed in 1936, strangled trade—and actually lowered Mexico's customs revenues.

That, says Almazan, is bad neighborliness, bad nationalism and bad business.

It is Cardenas' program as it has affected the masses on which Almazan concentrates, however. When Cardenas took office in late 1934, Mexico was nearing economic stability. Since then these things have happened:

The public debt has doubled, largely because of expropriations of oil properties, railroads, mines, the sugar industry, miscellaneous factories and 30,000,000 acres of land. These seizures, wiping out big segments of the normal tax revenue, have forced the government to lay stiff taxes on everything else. Currency has been inflated 70 per cent to take up part of the slack and to finance public works. The peso has dropped from 28 to 17 cents. Wage increases averaging 42 per cent won by incessant strikes have been swallowed by doubled living costs. Mexico, a wheat-corn-beans country, last year imported 100,000 tons of wheat and proportionate quantities of corn and beans because the new collective farms did not produce enough.

ALMAZAN—big, erect, handsome in a leonine way—throws back his head and roars:

"People of Mexico, you overthrew your oppressors in 1910, but you are being enslaved anew today by thousands of parasites and vultures who are reducing you to a deeper, more abject misery."

This is strong language, but it comes from a strong man. His name is hardly known outside Mexico—Vice President Garner is one of his few friends across the border—but Almazan long has been the hope of the conservative element in Mexico.

He promises to modify or undo most of what Cardenas had done. Car-

denas has believed that Mexico, with a civilization ranging from the feudal to the primitive, can be jerked forward three centuries in the six years of his administration simply by decreeing a series of reforms based on Russian models. Almazan demands gradual development based on private initiative, protection of capital's rights as well as labor's, improved economic conditions through increased production and consumption.

Pointing to the Cardenas design for Utopia, he says, "This is a very fine dream. But"—he explodes the word—"are you eating?"

The question touches the Mexican in a sensitive spot, his stomach. He has not been eating well of late, according to the government's own statistics.

One third of Mexico's population has been placed on lands taken from big estates and cut up into communal farms, under federal agents. Almazan charges graft and the empty treasury are responsible for the obvious failure of the scheme.

He believes a land-owning peasantry is essential.

"But," he asks the agrarians, "do you really own the land today? Or have you just traded the old land owner for a greater one in Mexico City?"

"I," says Almazan, "will see that you own the land. You, Pablo, will have your ten acres. You, Pedro, will have yours. You may cultivate it, or you may sit and look at it. But when the working man's crop comes in there will be no bookkeeping agent to rob him of it. That is what we fought for in 1910."

Like Cardenas, Almazan followed Francisco Madero in the 1910 revolution which exiled the dictator, Porfirio Diaz. His family, well-to-do land owners, lived in the mountains south of Mexico City. Juan, born in 1891, grew up in the day when Mexico was divided into the aristocracy, composing some seven per cent of the population, and the oppressed masses.

The young Almazan set out to study medicine. Whether the nineteen-year-old boy really had a social conscience or was simply seeking excitement, he left school to join the revolution.

Instead of the expected peace and reform, there followed Mexico's most chaotic decade. Madero, who had inspired the revolution, could not control it. He was forced out of the presidency in 1913 and murdered. The reactionary Huerta moved in.

Almazan by then was the twenty-two-year-old commander of the garrison of Morelos. He had no part in Madero's overthrow. He is now being attacked from the left because he did *not* revolt against Huerta. His explanation is simple: "Since Diaz' time, I have never revolted against established government." He takes care to emphasize that sentence. Charges of rebellious plotting have ended the careers of a long list of ambitious Mexican politicians.

There were times, however, when the established government was hard to identify. Fantastic cross-currents of revolution and simple banditry made a shambles of Mexico. It was every man for himself, and Almazan, tireless and magnetic, flourished in the chaos. In his middle 20's, he was a self-made general leading 15,000 men. Calles, succeeding to the presidency, picked him to command Monterrey, the country's most important army zone.

Since 1926, Almazan has been the big figure in northern Mexico. Governors come and go. Generals, too, are supposed to be shifted so as to minimize their opportunity to build a personal following. But Calles and the three Calles-made presidents who followed him needed a strong hand in the north, as was demonstrated in 1929 when Almazan quickly quelled a threatening revolt.

Cardenas has left his senior general discreetly alone—by tacit agreement as long as Almazan kept quiet. It was significant, however, that Cardenas sent Mexico City troops to hunt down the rebellious Cedillo in 1938 rather than call on Almazan. It is also significant that there have been practically no expropriations in Almazan's adopted state, Nuevo Leon.

Almazan, like Cardenas, has become wealthy. It is an old Mexican custom to give key men lucrative opportunities.

Almazan became a builder. Privately, he has developed resort properties from Monterrey to Acapulco on the southern Pacific coast. He heads a construction company which even under Cardenas has been awarded government contracts.

Construction of the Pan-American highway was stalled in 1931 by 130 miles of 10,000-foot mountains and river jungles. American engineers called the stretch impenetrable. Almazan took charge. Workmen tied to trees with ropes gouged the first faint trail out of the perpendicular mountainsides. Machines followed. They literally removed mountain tops. Communication was established within a year. The road is one of the great engineering jobs of the world.

It is the building of the Monterrey army post, however, that is Almazan's chief pride. It is a miracle of completeness.

Almazan believes that soldiers should be trained for civilian trades for the industrialized Mexico of the future. He points to the army post as Exhibit A. From foundations to electric wiring, the place is soldier-built.

When I first met him in 1933, he was building a summer home and resort center on a mountain shelf 3,000 feet above Monterrey, reached by a writhing six-mile road. The work was being done largely by soldiers. The general mentioned casually that he was privately doubling the army pay of men who would rather work than loaf on the reservation. I found later that this was true and that it was permissible under army rules.

Like every big figure in Mexico, he

maintains a costly home in the capital, but he spends most of his time in his mountain aerie, 600 miles to the north, where his chief diversion is a zoo containing all the country's wild animals. "I am a mountain man," he insists. "I do not feel right where things are flat."

ALMAZAN impressed me as the exact opposite of Cardenas. The idealistic and visionary president is one of the people, a taciturn Indian. He rides mule-back into mountain hamlets, squats and munches *tortillas* while he hears the people's woes. He speaks their tongue. He reaches them as an individual. He was the best-loved figure in Mexico. But the peasant has never understood and has grown to mistrust the complex economic and social plans which Cardenas himself propounds somewhat vaguely.

Business classes are naturally behind Almazan. Catholics have rallied to his promise of freedom of education. Since he declared for woman suffrage, women have formed pro-Almazan units throughout the country. At least a third of organized labor—the base of Cardenas' popular strength—is publicly supporting Almazan's charges that the unions are being exploited by racketeering leaders.

But, granted all this, can Almazan be elected President of Mexico?

Not by popular support alone.

The administration machine, now called the Party of the Mexican Revolution (P.R.M.), has always controlled elections, from village ballot box to final tabulation. Almazan is no Don Quixote to go charging such a steam-roller with a wooden lance. A hard-bitten realist, he would not have entered the campaign unless he had detected cracks in the machine. His plan for a miracle is to split the P.R.M.

Chances for such a feat are better than ever before. The big cogs of the P.R.M. machine—governors, generals and department heads—are pragmatists, willing to follow the leader so long as their own jobs and perquisites are secure. A dominant P.R.M. group decided in 1939 that Cardenas had gone too far left, particularly in his support of Lombardo Toledano, the radical labor leader, heir-apparent to the presidency. This group presented an ultimatum: It would not support Lombardo but would compromise on a more moderate Cardenas man. From that session emerged the candidacy of the mild General Avila Camacho, secretary of national defense.

Almazan watched these developments cautiously, and awaited the psychological moment.

When Washington cut the price paid for Mexican silver, adding the next-to-last straw to the country's burden, the general came down from his mountain shelf, expressing complete faith in Cardenas' promise of an uncontrolled election and offering to save the country.

There were immediate charges that he was being backed by the foreign oil interests. This seems unlikely. The oil men would like to see him president. But he may not win—and the oil people, who hope to make some settlement with whatever government comes next, could under Mexican law be shut off without a cent if there were any proof they interfered in politics.

Actually his campaign is financed by himself and a few wealthy friends, and by the sale of "patriotism bonds" —non-redeemable and suitable for framing — chiefly to professional, small business and church people.

Having proved that he has a huge, if incalculable, popular following, Almazan's strategy is to win over rightists and moderates of the P.R.M. who have little faith in Camacho's ability to hold the antagonistic elements of the machine together.

An open split of the P.R.M. would result in clearly defined rightist and leftist parties. The situation obviously is mined with explosives. Most objective Mexicans fear that developments may lead to nationwide violence. They feel, however, that Almazan must have foreseen all possibilities and planned to meet them—else why should he have come down from that mountain?

Mexico Today

THE principal industry in Mexico is mining, and until recently 97 per cent of the 31,000 mining properties were foreign owned. Foreign concessions number nearly 17,000. Mexican silver accounts for 40 per cent of the world's output. Petroleum production is huge and has been controlled mainly by three big companies in fields covered by 1,186 concessions occupying 30,866,894 acres.

The country's imports are mainly from the United States, 65.3 per cent; Germany, 11.9 per cent and Great Britain, 5.8 per cent. Exports are principally distributed among United States, 62.8 per cent; Great Britain, 10.1 per cent and Germany 7.1 per cent.

Mexico is governed under a constitution which was promulgated in 1917 to replace the Constitution of 1857. It was amended chiefly as to tenure of office in 1929 and again in 1933, and now provides that the president shall be elected for a term of six years, the 58 Senators for six years, half of the Senate being renewed at a time, and the 170 deputies for three years. Governors of the States, Mayors and State Legislators are also barred from succeeding themselves in office. The Senate has two members from each State and from the Federal District; the Chamber is elected on a population basis.

Mexico is declared to be a Federal Republic of 28 States each having a large measure of home rule and with governor, legislature and judiciary elected by universal suffrage in a general election. There are also two territories whose governors are appointed and may be removed by the President, and a Federal District containing Mexico City governed by Federal Commissioners. The President appoints a Cabinet of nine ministers and eight department heads with cabinet rank, who are responsible to him and may be dismissed by him.

The American School of the Air

Educational program of the Columbia Broadcasting Company constitutes the world's largest classroom

DR. WILLIAM C. BAGLEY

Professor Emeritus, Teachers' College, Columbia University; Secretary, Society for the Advancement of Education; Editor of "School and Society"

GROWING so fast that its importance has passed virtually unnoticed, an American radio program has quietly become geographically the world's most extensive educational enterprise. Its magnitude may be judged from the fact that, having blanketed the United States, it is reaching out to twenty-one other lands in the Western Hemisphere.

This vast enterprise is the American School of the Air. Although it is only ten years old, the school already serves each week some 200,000 American classrooms with an audience of 8,000,000 boys and girls. A survey completed in early March, 1940, showed that, in the Los Angeles area alone, 136,500 pupils in 3,900 classrooms use the program five days a week.

Since the announcement of the new enlarged School of the Air of the Americas by Sterling Fisher, the Columbia Broadcasting System's Director of Education, it has won friendly words from leaders throughout the New World. Five nations—Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Panama and the Dominican Republic—have accepted invitations to cooperate. Diplomatic representatives of most of the other American republics have recommended acceptance by their lands.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull has said: "It would be difficult to devise a form of international cooperation which holds more promise for the deepening and broadening of understanding between the peoples of the American republics."

Dr. L. S. Rowe, Director General of the Pan-American Union, has said: "It is difficult to over-estimate the magnitude of this project, not only from a strictly educational standpoint, but also by reason of the fact that it will serve greatly to strengthen the cultural ties binding the nations of Latin America to one another."

One reason for the ready acceptance of the project by other nations in this hemisphere may be the fact that it provides for contribution of material by all, and gives each the opportunity not only to share the culture of its neighbors, but also to have its culture shared by them.

What is this educational institution that has grown up during the past ten years? It is a series of five weekly broadcasts of a half-hour each in the fields of current events, geography, literature, music and vocational guidance. Each is adapted to a definite age level. The Thursday literature program, for example, a dramatization of carefully selected stories, is planned for listeners in lower elementary grades. It has an audience of at least 3,000,000 within the schools and an adult audience of 2,000,000.

Important to the workings of the program is the teacher's manual which is published yearly and sent to teachers on request. It provides background reading and follow-up activity to relate the broadcasts to classroom work. The programs are designed not to supplant the teacher but to supplant and vitalize his or her work. How widely the manual is used is suggested by the fact that, on a single day recently, among hundreds of requests for it, were those from a public school in Honolulu, a convent in Wisconsin, a penitentiary in Illinois, an Indian school in New Mexico, and a vocational school in Welland, Ontario.

Let us examine the program from both the sending and the receiving sides of the microphone. This year, to increase student participation, Friday's current event series for high school students is being broadcast from the auditoriums of various New York City high schools. The engineer's equipment is set up on the platform. Exactly at 9:15 A.M. E.S.T., the actors are before the microphone, scripts in hand. From the broadcasting studio a mile or two away comes the familiar trumpet call that ushers in all American School of the Air programs. Then, in a split second, the C.B.S. announcer back in the school auditorium takes over with the assembled actors in a dramatic representation of some current social or economic problem.

During the last ten minutes of the Friday broadcast, pupils at the high school from which the broadcast emanates conduct a debate on the issues in question. The subject may be "Social Security," for example. The issues are live ones and the students argue them with intense interest. Later in the day, the program will be re-broadcast from the studio for stations in the Central, Mountain and Pacific time zones.

Some stations on the network switch off the last ten minutes of the New York broadcast so that a similar debate from a local studio or high school may be sent to the schools in that listening area. Eighty stations have made these local forums a part of the Friday broadcast. With relish,

pupils all over the country carry on from the point where the actors in New York leave off. Prepared by their social studies' teachers from material in the manual, they express their own points of view on the problems that have been dramatized. Both pupils and other listeners in such cities as Tacoma and Birmingham seem to prefer the flavor of their own speech to that of New York. And next year, pupils and listeners in Manitoba and Haiti may feel the same way.

STIRLING FISHER, C.B.S. Educational Director since 1937, is a graduate of the University of Texas, his native state. From 1919 to 1929 he taught English, for the most part at the University of Western Japan, but came home often enough to study journalism at Columbia and receive an M.A. from the University of California. Then came a two year period with *The Springfield* (Mass.) *Republican* and the Associated Press, followed, in 1930, by a job with *The New York Times* which sent him to the Far East as specialist and correspondent. He served that newspaper for seven years and finally landed in his present position in April, 1937. Mr. Fisher is married, has two sons, plays squash furiously, and is a self-confessed fiend about travelling.

GRANDPARENTS of this radio-educated generation remember a classroom the equipment of which consisted chiefly of books, a blackboard and chalk. The little box on the teacher's desk has brought many great changes. By means of that box, leading authorities in many fields join the teacher in his or her work.

Let us look again at both sides of the microphone, considering the Tuesday music program. The program is conducted by Alan Lomax, Curator of the Archive of American Folk Song of the Library of Congress. Each week is devoted to a particular type of song; sea chanties may be presented one week, railroad ballads the next.

Lomax brings an authentic quality to the program. He is a "folk-musician." A tall young man, loose-limbed and carelessly dressed, he has a shock of black hair perpetually over his forehead and a guitar perpetually under his arm. He goes to New York from Washington the day before the broadcast, often bringing backwoods folk-singers with him, and rehearses with his guests.

From a typical C.B.S. broadcasting studio, he introduces his songs with a few comments about their background. He asks the children to join in the singing of one song and later rehearses them on another to be sung with him the following week. Then he explains a special orchestration written by a leading composer especially for this series. This is then played by the Columbia Broadcasting Symphony.

What happens, meantime, in the classrooms? There, as in the studio, there is preparation before the broadcast. The teacher reads in the manual an explanation of the program. If there is to be a song for general singing, it is mimeographed and distributed. The teacher finds in the manual references to stories or historical data dealing with the day's subject. Topics are assigned to pupils, who give short reports before the broadcast. Perhaps the teacher rehearses the pupils in a folk song.

The dial is turned and Lomax's voice comes over the air. The pupils listen attentively and often participate in the singing; throughout the country, hundreds of thousands of school children join in song. The broadcast over, the pupils discuss the music and the ideas presented. Then, in some schools, they discuss activities they would like to undertake to follow up suggestions made in the broadcast. Occasionally, students adapt their own verses to tunes that have been sung on the program.

In next year's series, "Folk Music of the World," a similar opportunity will be given to children, from Alaska to the Argentine, to join in the singing.

The American School of the Air was started in February, 1930, as a commercial enterprise. It was conceived during the era of prosperity and launched at the beginning of the depression. Sponsorship was withdrawn at the beginning of the second semester, whereupon C.B.S. took it over as a sustaining program. Then followed a period of experimentation in which programs for varying age levels were presented.

In its early stages, the series could not be widely utilized because few schools were equipped with radios and few teachers knew how to use the new medium. Gradually, as the program continued, and as local broadcasts developed, more and more teachers learned how to use radio in their classrooms. More radios were purchased for the schools. In some instances, Parent-Teacher Associations bought them, or, as in San Francisco, dealers contributed re-conditioned trade-in sets for school use. Sometimes the pupils themselves have chipped in to buy sets for their schools.

Rapid growth toward the institution's present size set in early in 1938. By that time, C.B.S. had well under way, under the guidance of Sterling Fisher, its Director of Education, a long-range plan for promoting recognition of the programs and increasing the numbers of pupils and teachers using them. Mr. Fisher combines a newspaperman's hard sense of reality with unusual idealism. His approach to the problem of developing the American School of the Air into a truly national institution has involved two convictions: (1) that official recognition should be obtained from educational leadership in the country; and (2) that for efficient nation-wide operations it must decentralize its activities and develop close everyday local relationships with superintendents, principals, teachers and pupils.

The steps toward these objectives have been systematic. It was hard going at first. It was as recently as February, 1938, that the first demonstration of the use of radio in the classroom was put on before a National Education Association convention. Before that time, the N.E.A. had not

permitted any sessions to be devoted to classroom radio. The way in which Mr. Fisher gained permission for a demonstration is an interesting story in itself.

Hearing that Admiral Byrd was to address the convention at Atlantic City and receive a special citation from the N.E.A., Mr. Fisher proposed to put on a dramatization of Byrd's Antarctic Expedition with Byrd and some of his men taking part. Permission was granted. The American School of the Air thus attained important recognition, for the N.E.A. comprises, with its affiliated groups, 983,000 teacher-members.

The script was written. Byrd and his men rehearsed, along with professional actors, and, at the appointed time, were standing before the microphone. Three thousand school administrators were seated expectantly before them in the great Atlantic City auditorium. Air time came, and—nothing happened. It took seven minutes to locate the person who, two seconds before the broadcast, had accidentally disconnected the public address system.

Despite the seven minutes' silence, that demonstration so convinced the N.E.A. of the value of radio in the schools that, since then, the American School of the Air has been demonstrated at every N.E.A. convention. At the most recent convention in St. Louis, a few weeks ago, the demonstration was of the new type of program to be employed in next year's series, with special emphasis on South and Central America. It was a broadcast of Elizabeth Coatsworth's story, *The Boy and the Parrot*. Incidentally, this was the first American School of the Air program to be produced in costume. In keeping with the story, the actors wore authentic Guatemalan clothes.

Today the American School of the Air has the active support of the National Education Association. In the past few years, one, then another, of its daily programs have been endorsed by that powerful group. This year the N.E.A. has adopted the entire series as its official national classroom radio project.

Only last August was official recognition by State Boards of Education sought for the American School of the Air. At present, eleven State Boards of Education have officially adopted it as recommended material for their school curricula. Hundreds of Boards of Education in cities and towns likewise have given it their endorsement.

At the St. Louis convention of the American Association of School Administrators in February came another step in the way of official recognition. Mr. Fisher called a conference of State Commissioners of Education and executive secretaries of all state teachers' associations, and there told of the plans for the following year. So satisfactory was the meeting that it was decided to make the conference an annual event.

Along with the process of developing more opportunities for pupil participation, Mr. Fisher has been working out other means of causing schoolmen throughout the country to regard the American School of the Air, not as a remote New York organization, but as their own institution, adapted to serve their needs.

Within the past six months he has been creating nation-wide machinery to bring Columbia's educational program into first-hand contact with local school systems. Acting on his suggestion, 112 of the 120 C.B.S. stations, covering nearly all the major population areas in the country, has designated educational directors. To coordinate their activities, Mr. Fisher has named five regional directors: for New England, the South, the Middle West, the Rocky Mountain area and the Pacific Coast.

He is also creating a new type of nation-wide Board of Consultants. Counsel henceforth will be obtained from more than seven hundred educators. Despite these numbers, the machinery is speedy and flexible, and a consensus of educational opinion can be obtained on less than a week's notice. Important parts of the machinery are the local boards of consultants of six to ten members each, appointed by station educational directors.

The purpose of the boards is threefold: (1) to assist in adjusting school schedules to a maximum use of the School of the Air, (2) to obtain reports on pupils' reactions and make yearly recommendations on material to be included and techniques to be followed, and (3) to help in selecting student groups for local participation in such programs as the Friday broadcasts in current events.

In the last year and a half, the number of techers using the program has increased 300 per cent.

The adult response to the series is unexpectedly large. The official adult audience rating shows that an average of more than two million adults in the United States listen every day. There was a marked increase in that number recently. Mr. Fisher decided it was unnecessary to stress the classroom aspect of the program in the introduction to each broadcast. He changed the opening of the scripts so as to lure adults at home into keeping the program on. As a result, the rating of adults rose immediately.

One reason for the number of adult listeners is the high entertainment value of the programs. Another reason may be that some adults, feeling a lack in their own educational backgrounds, seize this opportunity to bring themselves in touch with much of the best in modern thought.

How will the American School of the Air be changed to serve its new international purpose? The changes involved are relatively simple. C.B.S. will send to each country participating a rough outline of subjects to be treated. Committees appointed by the various ministries of education will send in material. Scripts incorporating this material will be written in New York. The same scripts will be used from the Hudson Bay to the Straits of Magellan. In English or in Spanish translation they will be sent out to the various countries, which will use them in their own productions over either public or private networks. And though they will be written so that local changes can be made as desired, the material broadcast will be essentially the same throughout two continents.

The enthusiasm with which the new project is greeted in our neighboring countries is expressed in the words of Dr. Francisco Castillo Najera, Mexican Ambassador to the United States, who looks to the expansion of C.B.S.'s radio school to "show the youth of today how intellectual and cultural cooperation works . . . for the maintenance of peace" in this hemisphere.

Saving the Soil

Six thousand acres situated near Winona, Minnesota, were bleeding to death in a dying valley 6 years ago

R. H. MUSSER

SIX YEARS AGO, the 5,916-acre Gilmore Creek watershed near Winona, Minnesota, was bleeding to death. Its lifeblood—liquid topsoil, mobile under the lash of rain—poured into Gilmore Creek with every heavy downpour. Gullies spread through the fields; crop yields went steadily down. In a dying valley farmers found it increasingly difficult to exist.

Gilmore Creek flows into Lake Winona, on the edge of the city. Six years ago, the lake was being choked to death by thousands of tons of silt which swept into it each year. The lake had been dredged in 1913 to remove silt deposits that were 40 feet deep in some places. But by 1933, silt again clogged the lake, completely filling a sizeable portion of its bed, so that dredging was again an obvious necessity.

By this time, however, Winona's citizens were asking themselves a pertinent question: Why dredge if Gilmore Creek is to continue to dump tons of soil into the lake after every heavy rain? They were beginning to realize that soil erosion—the process which made the Gilmore Creek watershed look tired and bedraggled—was the real problem. Unless that problem were solved, both Gilmore Valley and Lake Winona were doomed.

Today, the problem *is* solved, insofar as present-day agricultural science can solve it. Topsoil is "tacked down" on Gilmore Valley farms by such devices as strip-cropping around the hills, check dams in field ditches, trees on steep slopes, and rearranged cropping systems. Gilmore Creek carries much less silt than it formerly did. Lake Winona has been given a new lease on life. The slowly dying valley has been revived.

Back of this transition lies a story of intelligent planning and farmer cooperation which has heartened many a conservationist and given new hope to hundreds of dirt farmers.

Gilmore Valley is typical of the small watersheds which dot the "driftless" area of southeastern Minnesota, southwestern Wisconsin, northeastern Iowa, and northwestern Illinois. Here lie 18 million acres of land that the glacier forgot. When the last great ice sheet spread down over the continent, the "driftless" area—for some reason—was untouched by it. Consequently, the hills here retained their original shape—standing up steep and bare on an island in a sea of ice. Later, when the glacier retreated and before vegetation came in to protect the earth, gigantic dust storms blanketed the continent, sweeping billions of tons of soil across the plains. When the dust-laden wind struck the steep hills of the "driftless" area, it was slowed down and necessarily dropped part of its load of silt—just as a river does when it is blocked by a dam. Thus the valleys and ridges of the area, Gilmore Valley among them, came to be covered by deep layers of wind-blown loessial soil—rich in minerals, later to be rich in organic matter, but highly erodible.

Literally billions of plants and animals lived and died to create Gilmore Valley's topsoil. As the climate grew slowly warmer, trees and grasses came in. They mixed sunlight and air in the soil—built sunlight and nitrogen into their bodies through the process of photosynthesis and, upon their death and decay, poured sunlight and nitrogen into the soil. Thus, through thousands of years, a layer of humus or organic matter several inches thick was spread over the valley and ridge lands. Thus was formed topsoil—the crop-grower and stock feeder of later years.

Nature had achieved a delicate balance between the processes of soil building and the processes of soil erosion by the time the white man first saw Gilmore Valley. At that time, floods were a relatively rare occurrence, the steep hillsides were protected by timber, the valley and ridge lands by mixtures of grass and trees. Centuries of habitation by the Sioux Indians had left scarcely a mark on the land, but the white man quickly changed all of that. Heedlessly, he upset nature's balance.

SETTLERS began to come into Winona County between 1850 and 1854. Within 20 years Gilmore Valley was well populated, with most of the people living on tiny farms varying in size from 5 to 60 acres. They placed their farming emphasis on wheat—wheat to be shipped down Mississippi river barges from Winona. In the 1860's, Winona was the fourth largest primary grain market in the United States. Gilmore Valley farmers cut down the trees, plowed up the grassland, and planted wheat on every available acre. Sloping valley and ridge lands—which for thousands of years had been protected by forest litter or sod—were laid bare to the destructive forces of soil erosion. Crop rotation then practiced consisted of wheat for several successive seasons, followed by oats, barley, or buckwheat for a year or two (to "rest" the soil!), after which the land was again planted to wheat.

Thus the soil was left open and unprotected against heavy spring rains. Small wonder that erosion was enormously accelerated.

In June, 1887, an extremely heavy rain fell for about 20 hours. Soil was removed to plow depth from many of the ridge fields and a concentrated run-off from those ridges cut enormous gullies in the valley and hillsides. For the first time, rock and gravel washed down over valley fields. Gullies grew rapidly. Gilmore Creek became a wide stream, carrying more and more run-off and soil from the farms. Floods became an almost seasonal occurrence. Lake Winona filled with silt.

As the years passed, these natural conditions combined with economic conditions to force a shift in Gilmore Valley's farming methods. Soil and fertility losses resulting from continuous cropping to wheat brought about marked declines in wheat yields. Moreover, the opening of the great plains country to the west brought southwestern Minnesota into direct competition with areas where wheat could be grown on a larger scale and more cheaply. By 1890, wheat as a major cash crop had become definitely unprofitable and farmers were beginning to diversify, placing more emphasis on dairy and livestock farming. In the late 90's the first cooperative creameries were established at Winona, and thereafter dairying became the chief farm enterprise for the county as a whole.

The shift in farming emphasis—resulting in larger acreages of pasture and hay—undoubtedly served to slow down the *rate of increase* of soil erosion. The erosion problem, however, became steadily more serious as the years passed. Farmers continued to plant too much of their sloping land to corn and small grain, they continued to follow tillage and pasture management practices which encouraged soil washing, and their crop rotations were by no means adequate for soil conservation.

By 1933 farmers themselves were well aware of the need for erosion control. In cooperation with leading Winona citizens, they decided to take steps toward the establishment of a conservation program. A physical survey of the Gilmore Creek watershed was made in that year, and the data collected were used to support a petition from farmers and townspeople asking the Federal Government to establish a soil conservation demonstration project in the watershed.

The petition was acted upon favorably by government officials who saw that such a project would serve as a guide for farmers throughout the entire "driftless" or unglaciated area. In November 1934, the Gilmore Creek soil conservation project got underway.

It started none too soon. Between 1914 and 1934, the market value of cropland had decreased one-third. Cropland which had formerly sold for $60 an acre was valued at $40. Steep wooded pasture which had formerly been valued at $15 was valued at $10. Evidence that this decline in values was not due entirely to economic depression is the fact that permanent pasture land valued at $35 in 1914 had decreased only $5 an acre in value during the 20 years; erosion had had little opportunity to steal soil protected by pasture grasses.

Moreover, the *real* value of the land—as evidenced by its capacity to grow crops—had declined even more than the market value. Average corn yields had declined from 40 bushels per acre to 28 bushels per acre in the 20-year period. Barley yields had gone down from 35 to 20 bushels, wheat from 30 to 18 bushels, clover and timothy from 2 tons to 1.

First thing done by the crew of "doctors"—trained in soil science, engineering, agronomy, forestry, and farm planning—was to make a diagnosis of the valley's disease. Chief diagnostician was the soils man, who conducted a detailed soil survey. On air maps of the project area he recorded data as to the soil types, the degree of erosion, the steepness of slopes, and the present uses of the land. These data were used in planning erosion control programs for the farms.

In the meantime, at a farmer meeting the project staff members explained the purposes of the project, the type of programs to be established, and the ways in which individual farmers could cooperate in the work. Soon afterwards staff members visited farmers and recorded on maps plans for individual control programs. Every farmer was given an opportunity to sign a cooperative agreement whereby he agreed to follow the program planned for his farm for a minimum period of five years in return for expert assistance. Each of the fifty-four farms included in the program was planned as a unit, to include every acre of each farm, making use of ALL the different control practices needed to do the job on that farm. Farmers and Soil Conservation Service technicians worked together in framing the plans, and such factors as the economic condition of the farmer, his farming preferences, and his potential labor supply were carefully considered.

First of all, the farmer's cropping system was revised to bring his uses

Winona Farm shows stripped field originally worked in straight lines up and down hill. Legume hay on field has reduced erosion.

of the land more in line with its physical capabilities. In most cases, revision resulted in a reduction in the total acreage planted to crops and an increase in the acreage kept in pasture or protected woods. On fifty-four farms cropped acreages were reduced by approximately one-third —from 2,346 acres to 1,555 acres. In practically all cases, the acreages in such erosion-encouraging crops as corn and small grain were decreased while the acreage in erosion resistant legume hay crops was increased. On the fifty-four farms, the acreage in hay was increased by more than 50 per cent—from 625 acres to 981 acres. Prior to 1935 much of the hay acreage consisted of wild hay, having low feeding value, whereas at the present time the hay consists of legumes having high feeding value.

In conjunction with the changes in cropping systems, an extensive liming program was carried out on the project to correct the soil acidity which had formerly made successful legume seedings a rare occurrence. Approximately 3,000 tons of lime have been spread.

Another major change brought about by erosion control programs on the farms was the shift from straight-row to contour or around-the-hill cultivation on sloping fields. Every acre of sloping cropland is now protected by alternate strips of corn or small grain and legume hay running around slopes on the level or contour. Thus runaway raindrops find numerous obstacles across their path from ridge to river. Most of them become discouraged and soak into the ground to be used by thirsty plants.

As for the timbered slopes themselves, they have been protected against grazing on the fifty-four farms included in the program. Formerly, woods were commonly used for pasture purposes. The grazing animals trampled the leaf litter, destroyed undergrowth, prevented natural reproduction of trees, and in general lowered the value of the woodlots, not only as producers of wood products but also as defenders of the soil against erosion.

It was not difficult for Soil Conservation Service technicians to convince farmers that woodlots make mighty poor pastures, that cows and trees definitely do not mix. Moreover, the increase in hay and in grass pasture, brought about by the conservation programs, had done away with what had heretofore been a feed shortage on many farms.

General view of valley farms of two cooperators showing the valley floor with strips of alfalfa, grain and corn. Ridge shows gradino.

Approximately 300 acres of new woodland plantings have been made in the project area since the programs were started. These new plantings were made in steep denuded hillsides and in gullied areas. The needs of wildlife were considered in selecting wood species for planting purposes—and of course the entire program, by increasing the amount of natural cover and food, has been of marked benefit to birds and small animals.

Far from working an economic hardship on farmers in the area (which might be expected, considering the drastic changes in the farm set-ups), the conservation program has been of marked economic benefit to the cooperators in the few years since the project was started.

Gilmore Valley lies in the heart of the dairy region of Minnesota. Hence crop returns can be figured in terms of feed production with a fair degree of accuracy. And in terms of feed production, cooperators' farms in the area are now in better shape than they ever were before. The increase in hay and pasture definitely boosted farm incomes in the area during recent drouth years, average butterfat production per cow is on the upgrade, and several farmers have found it possible to increase their dairy and livestock enterprises as a result of the changes which have been made.

Farmers themselves are enthusiastic about the physical as well as the economic effects of the programs. They report that old gullies have healed over to a large extent and that virtually no new ones are now being formed. They report a marked decrease in the amount of silt washed from their fields through "sheet" or surface erosion. And—perhaps most significant of all—farmers living in the valley are no longer forced to devote hours of back-breaking work to the removal of rock and sand washed down from upland farms with every heavy rain.

The work has stood the test of two of the most intense rains to fall in the area since settlement began in the 50's.

On April 30, 1936, a total of 4.5 inches of rain fell in Gilmore Valley in the brief space of an hour and a half. Gilmore Creek went on a rampage, washing out a dam constructed just above Lake Winona and flooding fields along its banks. Great gullies were cut in unprotected hills in the area. Yet when Soil Conservation Service staff members went over the area next morning, they found surprisingly little soil washing on ridgeland farms—and this despite the fact that the program had not been in effect long enough to reach anything like a maximum of efficiency. Compared to the tremendous soil losses from farms in neighboring watersheds, farmed in the old way, losses from Gilmore Valley farms are slight indeed.

The second test came on June 19, 1937, when a rain of approximately 1.7 inches fell in about one hour's time, climaxing a series of rains which had left the soil well saturated.

(Continued on page 62)

What's YOUR Opinion?

A monthly department conducted by George V. Denny, Jr., founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air and President of Town Hall, New York

CURRENT HISTORY'S PRESIDENTIAL POLL OF THE NATION'S NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Who do you think *will* be nominated for President by the two major parties? Who do you think *should* be nominated for President by the two major parties?

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT will be nominated by the Democratic party for a third term—in the opinion of a large majority of the daily newspaper editors of the United States.

He will run for President in a country which—in the divided opinion of the editors—is more conservative in 1940 than it was in 1936.

His opponent will be Thomas E. Dewey—perhaps: this point demands immediate qualification.

The country's newspaper editors are by no means so like-minded in their prophecies about the Republican candidate for President as they are about the Democratic candidate. But 37 per cent of them think that the Republican party will nominate Dewey, as compared to 25 per cent who think it will nominate Senator Robert H. Taft of Ohio and 24 per cent who think it will nominate Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan.

To say that a certain number of editors think that a certain candidate for President *will* be nominated is not to say that the same number think he *should* be nominated.

The prevailing opinion among American newspaper editors is that Roosevelt *will* be the nominee of the Democratic party, and that Dewey *will* be the nominee of the Republican party. But the prevailing opinion also is that Secretary of State Cordell Hull *should* be the nominee of the Democratic party and that Senator Vandenberg *should* be the nominee of the Republican party. Note that the editors—distinctly, dramatically—do not think that President Roosevelt should be nominated again.

The newspaper editors of the United States always have been, and continue to be, regarded as authorities on political sentiment in their communities, in their states, and in the nation. It seemed worthwhile, therefore, to ascertain the opinions of the editors at this period when the states are beginning to elect delegates to the national party conventions which will nominate candidates and write platforms to guide us for the next four years.

CURRENT HISTORY, accordingly, asked the following questions of every daily newspaper editor in the United States:

"Who do you think will be nominated for President by the Democratic party?

"Who do you think will be nominated for President by the Republican party?

"Who do you think *should* be nominated for President by the Democratic party?

"Who do you think *should* be nominated for President by the Republican party?

"In your opinion, is the sentiment in your community more conservative than in 1936; more liberal; or about the same?"

The newspaper editors indicated their deep interest in these questions by their unusually heavy response, running to a fraction more than 30 per cent of all the dailies in the United States.

Of one thing, the editors are profoundly convinced, and if their opinion is sound, it has tremendous significance for this country:

No fewer than 69 per cent of them are convinced that the country in 1940 is more conservative than it was in 1936. Less than 3 per cent say it is more liberal than it was in 1936. Only 24 per cent say sentiment is about the same as it was in 1936.

Perhaps even more striking is the fact that, while 68 per cent of the editors think Mr. Roosevelt *will* be nominated by the Democrats less than 18 per cent of them think he *should* be nominated by the Democrats.

Are the country's newspaper editors overwhelmingly against Mr. Roosevelt, overwhelmingly against a third term, or overwhelmingly against both? Each reader must interpret their votes as he wishes.

Among possible Democratic candidates, the editors' preference runs to Mr. Hull; nearly 34 per cent of them think he *should* be nominated by the Democratic party, though only 19 per cent think he *will be.*

Among the editors the Democratic runner-up to Mr. Hull is Vice-President John N. Garner. Many of the

How U.S. editors answered the question: Who *should* be nominated for President by the Democratic party?

DEMOCRATS

HULL	GARNER	ROOSEVELT	WHEELER	MCNUTT	BYRD	JACKSON	FARLEY	CLARK	GLASS
33.96%	25.83%	17.08%	5.42%	3.33%	2.29%	2.08%	1.67%	.63%	.21%

editors—nearly 26 per cent—think Mr. Garner *should* be given the Democratic nomination. But less than 5 per cent of the editors think that Mr. Garner actually *will* come away from the Democratic convention with the Presidential nomination in his vest pocket.

In this poll, on the Democratic side, the also-rans trail far behind the favorites. Less than 3 per cent of the editors say that Senator Burton K. Wheeler *will* win the Democratic nomination; less than 5 per cent of them say that Paul V. McNutt *will* win it, and less than 1 per cent say that it *will* be won by Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia. And all this seems to satisfy the nation's editors right down to the ground, for less than 6 per cent of them think that Senator Wheeler *should* win the Democratic nomination; only 3 per cent of them say that Mr. McNutt *should* win it, and only 2 per cent think that it *should* be won by Senator Byrd.

But what of the other possibilities for the Democratic nomination—Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, Postmaster General James A. Farley, Senator Bennett Champ Clark of Missouri, Al Smith, Senator Carter Glass of Virginia, and a handful of others?

Plainly the country's newspaper editors think little of them as Presidential candidates. There are some votes for each of them, but relatively few.

So much for the prospects and merits of the most frequently mentioned Democratic candidates, as the editors of the country see them. What of the Republican candidates as viewed through the editors' eyes?

One striking thing is that the editors seem to prefer Senator Vandenberg to District Attorney Dewey as a Presidential candidate, but seem sure that Mr. Dewey has a better prospect of winning the Republican nomination than Mr. Vandenberg has. This conclusion is based on the following facts: about 19 per cent of the editors responding in this poll think the Republican nomination *should* go to Mr. Dewey as compared

How U.S. editors answered the question: Who will be nominated for President by the major parties?

The Democrats will nominate:

ROOSEVELT	HULL	MCNUTT	GARNER	WHEELER	JACKSON	FARLEY
63.13%	19.38%	4.79%	4.38%	2.08%	1.49%	.62%

The Republicans will nominate:

DEWEY	TAFT	VANDENBERG	GANNETT	HOOVER
37.08%	25.42%	24.58%	1.67%	.63%

to about 45 per cent who think it *should* go to Senator Vandenberg; but nearly 38 per cent think the nomination *will* go to Mr. Dewey as compared to 24 per cent who think it *will* go to Senator Vandenberg.

As a possible Republican candidate Senator Taft runs behind Mr. Dewey in the editors' favor, since about 17 per cent of them think Senator Taft *should* be nominated by the Republican party. Twenty-five per cent think he *will* be.

Former President Herbert Hoover retains a measure of support among the country's editors. Only a fraction of 1 per cent of them predict that he actually *will* be nominated; but 8 per cent think that he *should* be nominated.

Nor do the editors believe that the Republican nomination will be won either by Frank E. Gannett, newspaper publisher; Governor John W. Bricker of Ohio, or Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts. On the question of who *will* be nominated, none of them gets an appreciable vote, but on the question of who *should* be nominated, the vote for Mr. Gannett is 4 per cent, the vote for Governor Bricker about 4 per cent and the vote for Representative Martin is 3 per cent.

The editors do not believe that any other aspirant has a fighting chance of winning the Republican nomination. However, on the question of who *should* receive the Republican nomination each of the following candidates gets a handful of votes, more or less: Representative Bruce Barton of New York; Justice Owen J. Roberts of the United States Supreme Court; Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York; Governor Arthur H. James of Pennsylvania; Senator Charles L. McNary of Oregon; former Governor Alf M. Landon of Kansas, and Wendell Willkie of New York.

Many of the editors returned comments—some serious, some not so serious—with their ballots.

"Hell and Roosevelt only know" who will be nominated by the Democratic party, wrote one Arkansas editor, and many others, in less vivid language, also made the point that Roosevelt holds the key to the Democratic nomination; that he can have it himself if he so desires. In the opinion of one California editor: "Roosevelt should be nominated just to test the third term issue."

Several editors stress their opposition to Roosevelt by declaring for "any Democrat but F.D.R." or for "anyone F.D.R. opposes." On the other hand, several editors, some of them from the stoutly Democratic south, wrote that it makes no difference who the Republicans nominate, for no Republican has a chance. Said one Texas editor: "It would be a great economic loss for the Republicans to nominate anyone."

To the question, "In your opinion, is the sentiment in your community more conservative than in 1936?" Several editors not only replied in the affirmative but lent emphasis to their answers by adding "much more conservative," "decidedly more conservative," or words to the same effect. One editor in North Dakota thinks that sentiment in his community is more conservative because "People are more concerned over increasing national debt and possibility of war."

The accompanying map indicates which of the candidates are strongest among the editors in various sections of the country. It is based on

How U.S. editors answered the question: Who *should* be nominated for President by the Republican party?

REPUBLICANS

VANDENBERG	DEWEY	TAFT	HOOVER	GANNETT	BRICKER	MARTIN	WILLKIE	BARTON	LANDON
44.79%	18.75%	16.88%	8.13%	4.58%	3.96%	3.54%	1.88%	1.67%	1.46%

How U.S. editors answered the question: Is sentiment in your community more conservative or more liberal or about the same?			
More Conservative	*More Liberal*	*About the Same*	*No Opinion*
69.17%	2.71%	24.17%	3.96%

the answers the editors returned to the question: "Who do you think *should* be nominated for President by the Democratic party?"

As the map shows, Mr. Roosevelt's greatest strength is among the editors in the East South Central States (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi).

Mr. Hull's greatest strength is among the editors in the Mountain States (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah and Nevada).

Mr. Garner's greatest strength is in the Pacific States (Washington, Oregon and California), and, on the Republican side, District Attorney Dewey also is best liked in that same region.

Senator Vandenberg, who makes a good showing in his own East North Central section (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin), makes a still better showing in the Mountain States, polling 38.5 per cent.

Senator Taft makes his best showing in the East North Central States, in which he, like Senator Vandenberg, has his home.

Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that this same East North Central district returns the most decisive answer to the question: "In your opinion, is the sentiment in your community more conservative than in 1936; more liberal, or about the same?" More than 80 per cent of the editors responding from this district declare that sentiment in their communities is more conservative.

Many readers will wish to save these pages to see how nearly the actions to be taken at the national party conventions accord with the wishes and opinions of American newspaper editors. Following the conventions, many readers also may wish to check back on these pages to see how accurate the editors prove to be in the difficult capacity of prophets.

In this connection, the following facts may be of interest: As indicated by this poll, 84 per cent of the editors in New England think Mr. Roosevelt will be nominated. Nearly 77 per cent of the editors in the Mountain States think Mr. Hull will be nominated.

Turning to the Republican side, about 40 per cent of New England editors think Mr. Dewey will be nominated, and the same conclusion is reached by a slightly higher percentage in the South Atlantic States (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida). In the Mountain States, where 38 per cent of the editors think Senator Vandenberg *should* be nominated, more than 34 per cent confidently predict that he *will* be.

Nearly as confident are the editors of the East North Central States, where more than 30 per cent think the Republican nomination will go to Senator Taft.

What is YOUR opinion?

The editors of the nation showed a preference for Roosevelt, Hull, Garner and Vandenberg, Dewey and Taft in answering the questions: Who do you think should be nominated for President by the Republican party and by the Democratic party? The above map shows the geographical breakdown of all sections of the United States showing the sentiment of each section. The per cent chart at the top of the map can be used to measure the respective strength of the candidates in a particular section of the nation.

THEY SAY
Quotations from the World Press

F. D. R. Not to Run Again Correspondent Reports

—*Condensed from a column by Ernest K. Lindley, political correspondent of* The Washington Post. *The fact that Mr. Lindley has long enjoyed especially close relations with the White House made this column of nation-wide interest.*

Just before the President went South for his trip to Panama, one of the elderly stalwarts of the Democratic Party asked for an appointment with the President. This, in substance, is the conversation which ensued:

Visitor—Mr. President, I've been in Democratic politics and in Congress longer than most people, and for seven years I've gone down the line with you. Now for months I have been reading and hearing all kinds of reports about your plans. I feel I'm entitled to know what they are. Are you going to run for a third term?

R.—No—I'm not going to run again. I'm getting tired. It's time for some one else to take over this job. Of course, if the Germans overrun England and head in our direction I won't desert the ship. But unless something like that happens, I won't run again.

V.—If you don't run, Mr. President, who is the man?

R.—Well, I think Hull would be a good man. He's safe. He can be elected. He would keep us out of war. And he's a lot more liberal than a lot of people around here think he is. Of course, if we nominate Hull, we'll have to pick a strong man of recognized liberalism for Vice President.

V.—Whom do you have in mind, Mr. President?

R.—There's Bob Jackson. He's able, and smart, and liberal. There's Paul McNutt. He's a capable man. And there's Burt Wheeler—another good man. And there are others. We all have our individual preferences. Of course, some of these men have disagreed with me at times, and I have disagreed with them. But that's to be expected. I think we are all trying to go in the same general direction. We have some good men to choose from and I think we can all get together on a winning ticket.

V.—You didn't mention Jim Farley, Mr. President. What about him for Vice President with Cordell Hull?

R.—You know how fond I am of Jim Farley. He's a wonderful fellow. He's done a great job for the Democratic Party. I don't know of anyone more deserving of recognition by the party. And he's done more for me politically than any other living person, not even excepting my wife. But—, I've been traveling about and talking to people from all over this country for a good many years now. You know what a lot of people down your way would think and say if we nominated Jim for Vice President. I know, too, because I've lived among them. They'd say we were using Cordell Hull as a stalking horse for the Pope.

V.—That's right, Mr. President.

R.—And lots of other people in other parts of the country would say the same thing. I'm afraid we'd stir up a lot of prejudices and emotions that would confuse the whole picture. We might even end up with another Al Smith debacle.

In reporting this to a close friend, the elderly, wise, and utterly reliable visitor added: I hope he sticks by that resolution. But I'm not sure, yet. The lure of the Presidency may hold him. He looks energetic enough . . .

So ends the latest report on the exploration of the mind of the sphinx.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

Columnist Claims F. D. R. Will Have Third Term

—*Condensed from Hugh S. Johnson's column in* The New York World-Telegram

I believe that Mr. Roosevelt will be nominated and elected for a third term. Every time I say it I get a lot of indignant letters from people who agree with me—at least in being very much opposed to a third term for any man. The complaint is that this is "defeatism"—almost treason in the sense of "adhering to the enemy, giving him aid and comfort."

In the first place, to be either a "defeatist" or a "traitor," you have to owe somebody an allegiance for which you are fighting. I shall fight as hard as I can against a third term for Mr. Roosevelt, but I believe that a column that tries to be a fair comment on events and actions in general—hasn't any business tying up with any favorite to the exclusion of any contrary comment, at least until the issues are drawn and there is no other thing to say except "yea" or "nay."

In this view it is neither "defeatism" nor "treason" to say that I believe Mr. Roosevelt will be our next President—if that is my opinion—which it is.

As to his nomination—does a majority of the Democratic party desire it? Decidedly not. In Dixie there are curses not loud but deep. Southern Democracy has been the step-child of the New Deal. It threatens white political supremacy. It has taken the South's two-third rule away from the nomination. Its farm policy is ruining the foreign market for cotton. The South has received the lowest per capita handout for "recovery and relief." But the politicians of the South have been dragooned by New Deal pap, purge and power. They are now

only a minority without a veto in the convention. They must get on any band wagon that really starts to roll, or read themselves into the outer dark. In the election, the South will vote Democratic as usual.

The tradition against a third term and the trend away from the President among Democratic politicians—in their hearts—is almost as strong as in the North. What do politicos like Frank Hague in New Jersey and Chicago's Boss Nash care about Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal? They care principally for its handouts—but that is enough. Less powerful politicians are somewhat in the same category. You could count the really convinced and zealous New Dealers in the Senate on the fingers of one hand. If you were Siamese twins you could count all there are in both Houses of Congress on your fingers and toes. But here again the vast New Deal political and patronage machine controls political attitudes if not political thinking.

These are the gents who decide on the delegates and pick men of their own type. Whether or not he raises a finger, or even permits his name to be used, most of these men will not vote against Mr. Roosevelt. Some boy orator will arise at some time in the convention with a cross of gold and crown of thorns speech and it will be all over except the shouting—which will last for two hours.

In the election, there will be on the side of the President (1) the normal Democratic minority; (2) A majority of the Jewish people; (3) the farmers as long as they are sure of "benefit" checks; (4) the unemployed on relief; (5) most of the Negro race; (6) most of organized labor; (7, 8, 9 and 10) Republican ineptitude, disunion and lack of either a program or a sufficiently popular candidate—alle samee 1936. Figure out a way to beat that if you can. I can't.

Long Machine Broken By Sam Houston Jones

—Condensed from Lemuel F. Parton's newspaper column, distributed by the Bell Syndicate, and written after the collapse of the Long machine of Louisiana in late February.

Sam Houston Jones, the comparatively young David who toppled the Huey Long Goliath in Louisiana, is a corporation lawyer, representing 43 corporations, and says he is proud of it. He never took his coat off while he was campaigning, never talked swamp talk, kept his shoes shined, dished good grammar and never tore his hair.

Defeating Governor Earl K. Long, brother of the Kingfish, in the runoff primary, he gets the Democratic gubernatorial nomination, which means an election in Louisiana.

However, he fought like a wildcat, made a half dozen speeches and two radio addresses a day, swarmed all over the State and developed a carefully organized State, parish and precinct organization.

He is 42 years old, good looking, well educated and convincing. He is a political newcomer, little known when the Kingfish called him "High-hat Sambo". He replied that he had no high hat, but would not hesitate to get one if he needed it and would dress as he pleased. So he did and he made them like it.

Born in a log cabin in the deep piney woods of Southwestern Louisiana, he worked in a sawmill until he was 17. He entered the University of Louisiana, waited on table to help pay his way, went into the World War as a private, but never reached France, and returned to continue his education in a country law office.

He has been on both sides of corporation law practice, winning the fight for the rice farmers against the millers, and has engaged in some stiff fights with public utilities. On several occasions he defended cases for labor organizations.

The British Blockade Through American Eyes

—Correspondence from Washington to The London Sunday Dispatch *by Raymond Clapper, Washington correspondent of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.* The Dispatch *asked Mr. Clapper to clarify a paradox: Why is the United States, where opposition to Germany in this war is so widespread, so irritated over British blockade activities designed to bring Hitler to his knees? Mr. Clapper's reply:*

During the last two months I have travelled to the Pacific Coast and through the South and the Middlewest. Everywhere I found the strongest sympathy for the Allied cause. In the heart of Texas a few weeks ago a group of representative citizens told me that if it were apparent that the Allies were in danger of defeat, American sentiment would, in their judgment, support some kind of naval assistance. As the situation stands today sentiment opposes direct intervention, but it recognizes that defeat of Germany is highly desirable so far as our interests are concerned.

In protesting against certain features of contraband controls, our State Department was seeking, I think, to keep the record straight. In this it undoubtedly had the support of American public opinion, but largely for the same reason.

Our government and our people alike recognize that Great Britain is

Il 420, Florence

The Sun Sets on British Sea Power

fighting for its life and that the blockade is a major weapon. All we are asking, I think, is that in using the blockade Great Britain be as considerate as possible of American sensibilities.

We do not like to have our merchant ships detained unduly, or hauled into belligerent waters where our Neutrality act forbids them to go. We do not like to see armed landing parties seize mail from our airline pilots. In such matters we have the same sensibilities as the Britons. Furthermore, we are striving to preserve respect for our rights in the Far East and such incidents do not help us in that delicate situation.

Our people, I believe, are fully disposed to cooperate in enabling Great Britain to make her blockade effective. We only complain of being pushed around too roughly in the process. We can be persuaded to do many things that we can not be forced to do.

Seibel, The Richmond Times-Dispatch

Pinning a tail on the donkey

Community Gardens

-Condensed from an article by Karl Detzen in The Commonweal

Joe Small is one of 405 citizens, in Madison, Wisconsin, who in 1939 raised $20,000 worth of vegetables in eight community garden tracts scattered across the town. His own plot of borrowed land measures exactly 50 by 100 feet, like all the other 404 gardens. From it last year, by hard work and enthusiasm, he supplied his family with fresh vegetables all summer, and his wife canned enough to last all winter, too.

Like most Madison growers, Joe has a large family, and could not possibly feed it on his limited income from part-time work. Value of the gardens, however, cannot be measured in dollars alone. Public health is improved when low-income families get fresh green food and are kept in the sun all summer. More important, morale is bolstered by letting them grow their own food instead of having to accept relief rations.

Cost of the 405 gardens last year was $300, paid by the Community Union, and eight months' wages for one WPA employee. The eight tracts are lent by owners who are holding the land for investment. They range from a block of vacant lots, cut into 20 gardens, to the largest project of 115 plots. All are located in parts of town convenient to people who pay low rents.

Last season the gardeners raised 3,727 bushels of potatoes, 1,140 pumpkins, 9,800 heads of cabbage, 1,385 bushels of beans. Italian families go in heavily for squashes, Negroes often grow yams. Lately the Italians have been introducing Negroes to squash, and teaching them how to cook it. Negroes repay them by showing them how to raise and serve yams. Germans and Negroes, Finns and Russians, Poles and Italians swap recipes and delicacies, teach each other how to raise better vegetables. There's democracy!

The gardeners maintain order and enforce the rules in their own tracts, rarely have to call for aid. They know that they will lose their land if they are caught selling vegetables, stealing their neighbors' produce, or letting weeds grow in their own plots. For the latter, which is the crime of crimes, because weeds spread from poor gardens to good ones, they sometimes get punched by indignant neighbors. Last year no one was charged with stealing or selling, only half a dozen, after two warnings, were ejected for weeds.

Crop rotation, intensive cultivation, fertilizer from family garbage pails hoed into the soil, use of every square inch of land, coupled with the vigor and enthusiasm of the gardeners, result in immense yields, in spite of the fact that no water is piped to any of the gardens.

"We just got to take our chances of rain, like other farmers," one worker said. However, he was not doing exactly that. Each morning for a cloudless midsummer week, he and others had been out at sunrise, hoeing the night's dew into the soil.

Small as the gardens are, Madison's workers manage to find room in them for flowers. From spring till late fall all eight of the projects are checker-boards of bloom, with the individual lots outlined in narrow flower beds.

Any summer morning the streets leading to them are filled with families, from grandmothers to toddlers, carrying their tools and hurrying to work. They labor as family groups, each member doing his own part, each enjoying life in the sun, each feeling a sense of independence and of personal accomplishment.

Mrs. Robert Taft—a Helpmate Indeed

—Condensed from Dewey L. Fleming's column in The Baltimore Sun

Many a candidate's wife has advised her husband, helped him write his speeches and statements, coached him in their delivery, tutored him in campaign manners, jogged him up about his personal appearance and traveled with him on his tours, but Mrs. Taft will be the first to take to the stump for her candidate-husband while he is traveling another circuit.

Two principal reasons led Mrs. Taft to choose Minnesota as the scene of her first solo excursion in behalf of her husband's candidacy for the G.O.P. Presidential nomination. One is that Minnesota is her native State and she has many old friends there.

Another and perhaps more compelling reason is that Thomas E. Dewey and Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, two other aspirants for the party tag, have been out there recently, and the Taft-for-President forces thought it time to let the Minnesotans know about their man.

Mrs. Taft is in good training. For the last year she has been traveling with her husband on his barnstorming tours of the country, and the year before she stumped all but three of Ohio's eighty-eight counties to make him a United States Senator. She drove her own car in that campaign and once wrecked it. They had to pull her out through a window.

When Senator Taft was making speeches on the West Coast last fall, Mrs. Taft, who accompanied him, frequently made arrangements to address women's clubs at hours that did not conflict with the meetings her husband was addressing.

Martha Taft, whose education included some time at the Sorbonne in Paris, is rated as an able and effective public speaker. Many say a better orator than her husband.

Most of her training in politics and stump-speaking was obtained in the ranks of the League of Women Voters. She was the first president of the league's Cincinnati chapter, and for a number of years was the organization's national treasurer.

Mrs. Taft does not tell her audiences that her husband is a political wizard or miracle worker. She just reminds them that steady dependability, not brilliance and flash, is what the American people are looking for in the next President, and assures them Robert Taft offers just that.

"In school, college, law school and bar examinations he was always first in his class," she told an interviewer recently.

Mrs. Taft was born at Winona, Minn., a daughter of Lloyd W. Bowers, who was Solicitor General in the Cabinet of the Senator's father, William Howard Taft. Her mother's father was Tom Wilson, an Irish immigrant who became Chief Justice of the Minnesota Supreme Court and later went to Congress.

San Francisco Chronicle

"Big?—sure. But, boy! Are they slow!"

Boomerang

—Condensed from an article by Ludwell Denny in The New York World-Telegram

The difficulty now [after Finland] is that this Allied propaganda about another war to make the world safe for democracy is a boomerang. Not since Britain defaulted on her debt to the United States have the credulous been so shocked.

Maybe it would have been better for the Allies to have tried to sell their war to us on facts rather than on hypocrisy. They have some potent facts to parade.

The Allies are fighting in defense of the British and French empires—no more and no less. Sometimes the interests of democracy and the interests of the empires coincide. Sometimes they conflict. When those interests conflict, the empire interests dominate.

When empire interests are believed to be at stake, the British government does not hesitate to ditch democracy—not only in Finland, Czechoslovakia, Spain and India, but in betraying the United States in the Manuchurian guarantees.

This may seem sordid, but before Americans assume a holier-than-thou attitude they should remember that this is the same policy of selfishness pursued by all nations, including the United States. We don't have to go back to our breach of the long line of Indian treaties, or our Mexican and Spanish War imperialism, or how we got the Panama Canal or invaded Nicaragua. Today we will not even listen to Puerto Rican independence pleas because we think we need that island as a naval and air base for self-protection.

Once the disillusioned Americans understand that Britain is fighting to protect herself, as the United States would fight to protect itself, they will not be so bitter over Britain's failure to save Finland.

It is pertinent that a Gallup Poll in England showed the British people opposed to sending a British army to Finland—just as the American people opposed sending an American army. The cannon fodder—whether British or American or Swedish—objects to fighting except in "self-defense."

Because these wars are for self-survival—

Finland would not fight Germany

for Britain; she fought Russia for herself.

Britain would not fight Russia for Finland; she fights Germany for herself.

The United States does not fight Russia for Finland, or fight Germany for Britain.

Bishop, St. Louis Star-Times

Transplanting Season In Europe

Dermestes on the Job

—Condensed from The New York Herald-Tribune

Eight thousand beetles and their larvae are being employed by the American Museum of Natural History in the delicate job of cleaning the skeletons of shrews and other minute mammals whose bones are too fragile to be scraped by an osteologist.

The beetles are tiny, strong-jawed dermestes imported from Africa and whipped into top condition by George C. Goodwin, assistant curator of the Department of Mammals. Given a trial several months ago, they proved so accurate and efficient that they were kept on despite the misgivings of a few trustees who feared that the beetles might break loose and devour some of the mounted specimens.

The larvae are the best workers, sometimes feasting for twenty-four hours at a stretch without relaxation. The beetles have less power of concentration and waste too much time chasing one another across the carcass.

Mr. Goodwin first heard about dermestes three years ago. He brought a small colony from Africa and housed them in a specially built cabinet heated by thermostat control to temperatures ranging from 80 to 85 degrees. The interior was lined with galvanized metal to prevent escape.

The beetles prefer fish, but do their best job on a shrew's skull. A shrew's teeth are almost microscopic, and the whole skull—rarely longer than three-quarters of an inch—is so tiny that experienced osteologists are seldom able to strip away the meat and sinew without damaging the bone structure.

Mr. Goodwin lets five or six young beetles go to work on a shrew. They generally have the skull immaculately clean in twelve hours. Great care must be taken that the beetles are not kept too long in the specimen box or they might eat into the delicate ligaments that hold the bones together.

Most of Mr. Goodwin's beetles have been removed from his office cabinet to incubators in a remote wing of the museum, putting considerably more distance between them and the mounted specimens. So far not one has escaped.

Blackout Law

—Condensed from The Manchester Guardian

Motorists have little cause to love the blackout, and their troubles will not be lightened by a decision given in a London County Court. The defendant was a driver who had stopped his car at the end of a side street and was waiting dutifully until he could pass safely into the main-road traffic. It was dark, and the car was naturally lit dimly only at front and back. While it waited a pedestrian, not seeing it, walked into it from the side. He injured himself, and the Judge awarded him damages and costs. As the Judge pointed out, the letter of the law remained, in spite of war measures, on the pedestrian's side. It is stated simply in the Road Traffic Act of 1930 that

> if any person in charge of a vehicle causes or permits the vehicle . . . to remain at rest on any road in such a position or in such condition . . . as to be likely to cause danger to other persons using the road, he shall be guilty of an offense.

The motorist might have admitted that his car was "in such condition" but have argued that all power to do anything about it had been taken from him by the Government's removal of street lighting and its curtailment of his car's. This, however, is no defense against the law as it stands.

Little People in the War

—Condensed from an editorial in The New York Daily News

The blackouts and the food restrictions are getting like itch powder under the skin of the little English clerk and of the little English farmer, laborer, apprentice. Similar war nuisances are itching the French little shots who in their millions make up the French nation. The same thing is happening in Germany. Why?

Well, on Aug. 24 last Adolf Hitler announced his non-aggression treaty with Josef Stalin, and stepped up his demands on Poland from Danzig and East Prussian access thereto to Danzig and the Polish Corridor. When he started his Blitzkrieg against Poland Sept. 1, the British and French Governments declared war against him—but didn't go to the defense of Poland. Hitler's legions mopped up Poland, and Stalin cut himself in for a piece of the loot.

But the war goes on. And the little people in all the warring countries are bearing its increasing weight of physical and mental misery, while the big shots have a good time out of it all. We cannot see what difference it makes to a little English clerk, to a Paris taxi driver, or to a Berlin hofbrau beer slinger, whether the farmers in the Polish Corridor live under the German or the Polish flag. Why should such a question drag these little people out of their accustomed ways of life, and throw some of them into battle lines and all of them into blackouts, meatless days, air raid scares?

The same is essentially true of the Polish Corridor farmers themselves. What they want primarily is to work their farms in peace, under some ruler who won't take quite all of their money and put it into guns.

The same for the farmers of Transylvania. Just so their rulers were reasonably liberal about taxes and letting them live their own lives, it couldn't make much difference to them whether they went on living under King Carol of Rumania or went back to Admiral Horthy's Hungary. The same for the little people everywhere.

As we see it, the reason why the war goes on is illuminated by the love of various European big shots for uniforms, for publicity, for pomp, for parades.

Mussolini has long seemed to fancy himself as some kind of Julius Caesar reincarnate. Hitler talks as if his dream grandfather were Frederick the Great, and he was a worthy grandson. Stalin acts like Peter the Great in many interesting ways. And we've long suspected Winston Churchill of imagining himself a modern-day merger of the Black Prince and the Duke of Marlborough, retaining the best features of each.

It is these big shots who keep the war going, just as it was the kings and sometimes the cardinals who kept the wars going in the old days.

Naturally Ribbentrop, for example, gets a huge kick out of galloping around by airplane on momentous missions, pausing to salute the cameramen. Naturally Ciano, Churchill and other civilians love to doll up in semi-uniforms and swank around while cameras click and sound reels grind. All this gives them the intoxicating feeling that they are statesmen making history.

Talburt, New York World-Telegram

Peace!

The European big shots are not wise leaders of states. They are marplots, who will yet bring Europe to a mass butchery of little people unless they can be headed off by the Pope, the President of the United States, and other men of good will and human decency.

Rumania's Dictators

—*Condensed from* De Groene Amsterdammer, *Amsterdam weekly*

The question whether Rumania in time of danger can count upon unified and active support of the Rumanian people has to be answered in the negative. The reason is the people's want of confidence in their own government.

Rumania's dictatorship is supported by a handful of men who have little contact with the population. They guide the nation with the aid of bayonets. This dictatorship has made itself master of the country by intriguing against those who stood by their democratic principles. The personal representative of this regime is King Carol who, ten years ago, returned from exile. He has succeeded in making himself one of the most powerful and one of the wealthiest rulers of Europe.

The Rumanian people, however, have not forgotten their democratic sentiments. They did not fight for a unified and independent country in order to be tyrannized anew and this time by their own nationals. A majority of them still are faithful to former leaders.

Congratulations "Collect"

—*Condensed from* De Telegraaf, *Amsterdam*

A complaint against the refusal to send a telegram to Moscow was filed a short while ago with the Netherlands Ministry of Defense by the Communist D. Wijnkoop. The message had been sent by the Communist newspaper *Het Volksdagblad* to a Russian news agency. It contained birthday greetings addressed to Stalin and a message to the leader of the Finnish "People's Government," Kuusinen.

The Minister of Defense explained that the telegram had been held up because its content had been considered insulting to a government with which Holland maintained friendly relations [Finland]. As the telegram had not been sent, the tolls which had been paid would normally have been returned. In the present case this could not be done, as the telegram —with its birthday greetings to Stalin—had been sent "collect."

Cupid Defies Air Raids

—*Condensed from* The Nottingham Post, *England*

Because of the nightly use of air raid shelters for courtship by young couples, the local authorities of Grimsby have taken steps to provide these shelters with closed doors. Luckily there have been no night air alarms lately. If we had had an alarm, we should perhaps have been unable to find room in the shelters, owing to the young couples who occupied them.

If Germany Wins

—*Condensed from an article in* Vu, *Paris, by Salvador de Madariaga*

The difficulty concerning war—as well as divorces, deaths and all other human things—is that they are never traceable to one single cause. They have many roots in the past and many ramifications towards the future. We have been told that this war is a struggle for supremacy between Britain and Germany. That is so. But this war is much more important than an ordinary struggle for supremacy. I

see nothing wrong in a struggle for supremacy. Life would be a sad spectacle if all men were satisfied to align themselves with the laziest and if all nations were satisfied with the development of the most backward. What is reprehensible is to try to obtain supremacy by wrong means, by a struggle of fists when the development of humanity demands a struggle of brains. The difficulty with Germany lies not in the fact that it wishes to become the principal power of Europe, because that might be an excellent thing in itself, but in the fact that it wishes to achieve this position by reducing to slavery all other nations and all other human beings.

From the point of view of a nonbelligerent, that is the most important cause of the present war. All the small nations of Europe know that, if Germany wins this war, they will cease to exist. Now that Czecho-Slovakia and Poland have been liquidated, anybody who denies that does so on his own risk. "That man is crazy. I say it and he proves it," says a witty Frenchman. And we can say that Germany will liquidate every little nation which falls into its power. We say it. Germany proves it.

Why then do the neutral European nations remain neutral? First, because collective security, to which they remain faithful, has failed without their being responsible for this failure, and this has made them lose confidence in international treaties and promises. This attitude is no longer justified but it survives nevertheless because men do not easily change their state of mind.

There is another reason for their neutrality. Everybody is afraid of the war, the belligerents included. This fear may mark the birth of a new wisdom.

The attitude of the small nations toward Germany is not different from that of small birds in the presence of a big snake. They are paralyzed to such a degree that they are even afraid to move in their own defense. They remain prostrate, disturbed and afraid, trying not to attract attention and hoping against hope that they may be unnoticed.

Nazi methods have thus reduced international life to a kind of jungle atmosphere. Small nations are impelled to group themselves under the wings of the large nations. Those remaining outside are lost. This foreign policy of Germany develops in the same way as its internal policy. In internal policy, the man who is not a member of the party does not have any rights, as a citizen and even as a human being. His property, his home, his body, his honor are at the mercy of the dirtiest boot adorned with the Swastika. For that reason, this war reaches a much lower level than the previous war.

During the last war, men fought for more or less real or abstract ideals, for liberty, democracy, a league to enforce peace. At present, humanity struggles to maintain life, for what makes life worth living, for the right to live from one's labor with one's wife and children in the home created by oneself, under the protection of equitable laws. Men are fighting now to maintain life at the level below which they cannot descend without becoming a herd of cattle.

The danger—the general fall of humanity to the level of animals—is real and universal. I admit that, as far as I am concerned, most of the things told to Americans about the German danger are exaggerated. Germany cannot extend its political sway over any American State. Nazi authors are not above partitioning the American continent according to their appetites. But the barriers are too formidable to make this a reality. On the other hand, the danger of a general decline of civilization from a German victory would be very real if such a victory were possible.

The Daily Herald, London

"But what big teeth you have, grandmamma!" "All the better to eat you with, my dear!"

Nothing succeeds like success. If Germany emerged victorious from the present war, the sub-human methods of today's German leaders would extend to the American continent, because, after all, the sub-human exists everywhere where the human exists.

Many who today curse Nazism would then be ready to praise it and to imitate it. The danger for America is therefore direct and serious, though it is not military or diplomatic.

It is not a rhetorical figure but the naked truth to say that between America and the jungle there is nothing except the Maginot Line and the British Navy.

Finland's Defeat: Views of the European Press

—Extracts from various publications following announcement of the Russo-Finnish peace.

HANDELSBLAD, AMSTERDAM: "The Allies left Finland to her fate. The Finns enter the same boat with Poland and Czecho-Slovakia. The Allies pretended to give aid but the impression was of reluctance and impotence. This is not a policy in which Europe can place much faith."

LORD BEAVERBROOK, IN THE DAILY EXPRESS, LONDON: "What is the reason for the gloom and pessimism over the defeat of Finland? What is startling? You knew Finland would fall. . . . You are well out of the Finnish expedition and you are no worse off than you were last November."

DAILY TELEGRAPH, LONDON: "On a short view there is certainly a gain for Germany, but on sober reflection the Nazis might well be counting the price. Field Marshal Hermann Goering's *National Zeitung* of Essen airily asserts that 'Soviet Russia now acquires in Europe the position which is her due,' but it is a position acquired pre-eminently at the expense of Germany. It is a position which not merely bars the expansion of her living space to the east but effectively outflanks her in the north and places her secular enemy in command of the Baltic.

"No wonder Hitler is trying to throw dust in the eyes of his own people by pretending that this Finnish peace is 'a unique political defeat for London and Paris.' The concern of London and Paris was solely to prevent the extinction of yet another lamp of civilization."

VOELKISCHER BEOBACHTER, BERLIN: "Finland could have had *peace with Soviet Russia much more* cheaply. Now, however, it has learned the same lesson as Czecho-Slovakia and Poland.

"We are eager to see whether other lands finally will take the bitter lesson to heart."

NACHTAUSGABE, BERLIN: "Whoever has depended upon Britain must basically revise his political calculations. That is the fate of Finland. That is also the fate of the northern states, which have just escaped with a whole skin out of a decades-long, falsely oriented foreign policy. Many other neutral states have just time enough to reflect."

GAZETTE DE BRUXELLES, BELGIUM: "Helsinki gave in at the moment London and Paris announced they were prepared to come to Finland's aid with all the resources at their disposal. Why? There is a moral to be drawn from this painful occurrence: the manner in which the Russian-Finnish conflict ended proves, alas, that once again violence continues to pay."

NEUE ZEITUNG, ZURICH, SWITZERLAND: "The promises to Finland of help from the Western powers may have strengthened her position in the peace negotiations but in the main they came too late and were not convincing enough."

"Look, he is a photographer by trade!"

OSSEVATORE ROMANO, VATICAN CITY: "Every will has its limit. While all the lights of ideology seem to be extinguishing themselves in this Europe, tired of its civilization and its grandeur, one light still remains. It is the light of the sacrifices *of Finnish youth who have shed* their generous blood for the independence of their fatherland and for the defense of Christian civilization against bolshevism. The so-called peace does not dishonor Finland but offends the European conscience."

PRAVDA, MOSCOW: "The war incendiaries have suffered a cruel defeat. They have lost their most important bases for their planned campaign against the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union stands unshaken as a guardian of peace and as a buttress of hope for toilers.

"The valiant Red army broke through the fortress of the Karelian Isthmus. Inspired by patriotic enthusiasm, the fighters, commanders and political functionaries of the Red army and the Red navy showed there are no fortresses that the Bolsheviki cannot take and that the Red army is the reliable defense of the Soviet Union, a grim sword for all its enemies.

"The Soviet people achieved what they wanted. They are indebted for this to their heroic Red army, the memory of whose exploits will live forever among the Soviet people. They are indebted for this to the wise, firm policy of their government, which will be able to insist on its own peace for the safety and quiescence of the Soviet land. Peace triumphs on the borders of the Soviet Union."

IZVESTIA, MOSCOW: "The treaty of March 12 liquidates the anti-Soviet war theater prepared for decades with such great care by our enemies. It consolidates the safety of the Gulf of Finland, Leningrad, the Murmansk Railway and Murmansk. It lays a foundation for the development of good neighborly relations for Soviet-Finnish cooperation in the economic field."

UUSI SUOMI, HELSINKI: "In truth, we have reason to sorrow and hang our flags at half mast. Our native land is like a wounded bird shedding its blood. It is impossible artificially to heal the wound."

First you Listen – then you find yourself SPEAKING FRENCH *like a Parisian*

French or German, Spanish or Italian, Portuguese, Swedish or Dutch—choose the language you would like to know, and in a few weeks you find yourself speaking it fluently and with a perfect accent.

That is the amazing thing about the new way of learning languages—originated by the Linguaphone Institute—which has proved so successful that it is already being used by countless students all over the world and in over 11,000 Schools and Universities.

SEE HOW EASY IT IS

You sit down in comfort in your armchair and listen to a series of records *on Your Own Phonograph*, spoken by expert native teachers. As you listen you follow in the illustrated key book the printed words that your teacher is using. Very soon you become so sound-perfect and word-perfect that you are able to begin talking, reading and writing quite fluently! The correct pronunciation comes naturally—because you have never heard a word incorrectly pronounced.

Linguaphone Home Study Courses

Linguaphone Institute is a veritable university in the number of language courses it offers.

French	Spanish	Portuguese
Italian	German	Russian
Swedish	Irish	Dutch
Latin	Greek	English
Chinese	Japanese	Persian
Polish	Esperanto	Czech
Bengali	Finnish	Hebrew
Hindustani	Effik	Afrikaans
Hausa	Arabic	Malay

SEND FOR FREE BOOK

containing a complete description of Linguaphone's unique method and how you can apply it successfully. Call at our Studio for FREE demonstration.

Whether you wish to learn a new language for business reasons, for travel or for a better understanding of literature, science and the arts, you will find that the quickest, easiest and most interesting way is by Linguaphone. Write today for the FREE book which gives you full details and will show you how you can learn to speak any foreign language easily.

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
50 RCA B'ld'g., New York City

Without cost or obligation, please send me the Linguaphone Book.

Name ....

Address ....

City .... State ....

Language Interested ....

Chronology of the European War

FEBRUARY 20—Russian troops hammer at Koivisto, western anchor of the Mannerheim Line. Hundreds of Russian bombers sweep over Finland in day and night raids. Reports that British warships have appeared near Petsamo, in Finland's far north, create rumors that the Allies have decided to send help to Finland through that Arctic gate.
—London discloses that in the week ending February 17 Britain lost five ships and the neutrals fifteen.
—The Turkish press declares flatly that any attack against the Balkans would bring Turkey into the European war.

FEBRUARY 21—The small Swedish town of Pajala, six miles from the Finnish border, is bombed by seven Russian planes and set afire. Stockholm protests to Moscow.
—It is disclosed that American Red Cross aid has been barred from Germany's conquered Polish territory except in areas around Warsaw. In Bohemia-Moravia it is reported that arrests are continuing and that German economic measures threaten ruin to the subdued Czechs.
—Germany challenges Rumania's prohibition against shipments of high test aviation gasoline to the Reich and decides to send a negotiator to insist upon full delivery of the 1940 quota.
—It is learned that the British began censorship of U.S. air mails at Bermuda on January 18 by seizing letters from a Pan-American Airways Clipper.
—With improved weather, there is renewed artillery and infantry fire on the Western Front.

FEBRUARY 22 — Showing increasing concern over the possibility of war in the spring, Rumania increases her armed forces and bans the export of raw materials and goods necessary for national defense.
—The Russians consolidate their positions in Finland and conclude winter fleet maneuvers in the Black Sea.
—Britain rejects a United States protest against seizure of German exports, while in Bermuda the chief censor denies that U.S. mail was removed from a clipper at bayonet point. Congressional circles in Washington express resentment over censorship methods at Bermuda.

FEBRUARY 23 — Following rumors that Soviet troops had crossed the frontier, Turkey's Supreme Defense Council is reported to have proclaimed a state of emergency.
—While former War Secretary Hore-Belisha urges Britain and France to intervene with military force on behalf of the Finns, the Red army presses its drive against the western half of the Mannerheim Line.
—The Allies extend the blockade against Germany into the Arctic in an attempt to halt transport of iron ore from northern Norway to the Reich.
—Berlin reports that Chancellor Hitler will receive Sumner Welles, peace envoy sent to Europe by President Roosevelt, and present Germany's views on the war.

FEBRUARY 24—Prime Minister Chamberlain, addressing a home town audience in Birmingham, declares the Germans must set up a government that can be trusted, and pledges economic justice to the Reich after the war.
—Chancellor Hitler, speaking in Munich, warns Germany's foes that as long as he is at the helm the German people will not perish, "even if the world were populated by devils." The occasion is the twentieth anniversary of Hitler's first public appearance. Hitler stresses the fact that Italy, Russia and Japan, all foes of Germany in the last war, are now "benevolently neutral."
—Russian troops concentrate on attacking the island defenses of Viborg, vital center in southeastern Finland.
—The threat of war diminishes in the Near East as Turkey denies that a state of emergency has been declared or that border incidents have occurred involving Russian forces.
—German aviators fly over French territory, while British aviators fly deep into Central Europe, reaching Prague.

FEBRUARY 25—Pan-American Airways announces that its eastward-bound trans-Atlantic planes will omit the Bermuda stop after March 15, following British censorship of clipper mails.
—Under-Secretary of State Welles is received with little fanfare on his arrival in Rome.
—Sweden, Norway and Denmark form a bloc which will seek to keep out of Europe's two wars and obtain compensation for war losses. Norway urges arbitration on Britain in the *Altmark* case.
—Moscow denies that Soviet planes bombed the Swedish town of Pajala.
—Francis B. Sayre, U. S. High Commissioner to the Philippines, declares in Manila that the United States probably will carry out the Tydings-McDuffie Act under which the Islands will receive their independence in 1946.

FEBRUARY 26—Helsinki admits abandoning forts defending Viborg Bay, but declares that the Finns are holding their lines elsewhere.
—Under-Secretary of State Welles delivers an "autographed message" from President Roosevelt to Premier Mussolini, the contents of the note being kept secret.

FEBRUARY 27—The war in the air enters a more active phase as British bombers fly along the Baltic coast and penetrate into Germany as far as Berlin. German planes attack shipping near the Firth of Forth in Scotland. Others wing over northern France.
—It is announced that the British battleships *Nelson* and *Barham* have been damaged by the Nazis.
—Finland's north Arctic army continues to retreat, harassed by Russian planes bombing and machine-gunning their lines.
—The Turkish Cabinet coordination committee calls all Turkish ships home from abroad.
—A House committee refuses to recommend immediate construction of a third set of locks for the Panama Canal, as advocated by President Roosevelt.

FEBRUARY 28 — Dutch anti-aircraft batteries blaze sporadically from 10:00 P.M. until 3:00 A.M. as unidentified foreign planes cross that neutral area.
—The way is cleared for a $20,000,000 credit for Finland from the United States when the House passes a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $100,000,000.
—Under-Secretary of State Welles prepares to leave Rome for Berlin. There are indications that Germany may use Welles' visit as the basis for a peace offensive.
—The British government prohibits Jews from purchasing land in one large region of Palestine and restricts their purchases in another area. A White Paper announcing the action arouses charges that Britain is going back on its promise during the first World War to support both Arab and Jewish claims in Palestine.

FEBRUARY 29—Massed Red army forces press steadily on Viborg, which has long been evacuated by its 70,000 civilian residents.
—Announcing suspension of trade negotiations with Rome, London discloses that the British navy has been ordered to halt all shipments of German coal consigned to Italy.
—Making his first appearance before a congressional committee since he was Secretary of Commerce, former President Herbert Hoover declares that $50,000,000 is needed to feed seven million persons destitute in occupied Poland and estimates Finland's food needs will cost $10,000,000. He says most of this money must come from the United States.

MARCH 1 — The British freighter *Southgate* reports she is being attacked by a submarine off Puerto Rico—in other words, that the war at sea has again spread to the neutrality zone set up by the American Republics. Meanwhile, the German freighter *Troja*, intercepted by a British cruiser, is scuttled off Aruba, Dutch West Indies.
—The Russians report occupation of the southern outskirts of Viborg.

—Under-Secretary of State Welles is told by Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop that Germany will fight until the British "plutocracy" has been shattered.
—Civil disobedience is threatened by the Congress group in India, which opposes that country's participation in the war while India itself is denied independence.

MARCH 2—Chancellor Hitler tells Sumner Welles Germany's war aims, reputedly making these points: 1. The question of war or peace is one for the Allies because Germany was attacked and therefore will fight; 2. Germany demands security of living space in Central and Eastern Europe and a Monroe Doctrine of her own for that region; 3. Germany demands "assured freedom" of the seas which would prevent Britain from again imposing a long distance blockade on Germany or any other country; 4. Germany demands return of former colonies and a share in the world's riches; 5. Germany wants an economic reorganization of Europe which will permit "dispossessed" but young and powerful nations to trade on equal terms with the rich "plutocracies"; 6. Germany demands armament limitation that will guarantee general security. Meanwhile, the Reich high command issues a review of the first six months of the war which purports to show that the losses of the Allies in all fields are greater than the German losses.
—The British freighter *Southgate*, which reported being attacked by a submarine off Puerto Rico, is located by U. S. naval planes, which report that she is in no danger and the Navy Department in Washington is mystified over the reason for the false alarm.
-Two Belgian army planes are shot down in a clash with a German bomber over Belgian territory and Brussels lodges a stiff complaint with Berlin.

MARCH 3—More than a hundred lives are lost when a German plane bombs the 8,441-ton British India steamship *Domala*, setting her afire in the English Channel. The bombing follows within a few hours the radio announcement of Grand Admiral Erich Raeder that Germany will wage uncompromising warfare against all British shipping.
—Under-Secretary Welles leaves Berlin for Paris, following a day of conferences with Rudolf Hess and Field Marshal Goering.
—While the Finns insist that they still hold Viborg, the Russians circle to the north of the city.
—Official circles in Washington are informed, a few hours after President Roosevelt's return from a Caribbean

cruise, that he personally obtained direct assurance from Colombia, Panama and Costa Rica that they would allow American military planes to use their airports if necessary for wartime defense of the Panama Canal.

MARCH 4—A crisis threatens to develop between Rome and London when an Italian note protesting the coal blockade is published and turns out to be so strong as to be a virtual defiance of the whole Allied system of contraband control. Several Italian vessels, loaded with coal in Germany, prepare to run the blockade.
—Britain reminds the Italians that troops from every British African territory have been concentrated on the borders of Italian-held Ethiopia.
—The city of Viborg is still reported in Finnish hands.

MARCH 5—Ignoring Italy's plea that German coal is indispensable to the life and work of the Italian people, British warships force seven Italian coal ships into a contraband base.
—Moscow, which had denied bombing the Swedish town of Pajala on February 21, expresses regrets for it.
—The first British communique from the Western Front reports that Germans killed two British soldiers in a raid and took some prisoners.

MARCH 6—The 85,000-ton British liner *Queen Elizabeth* eludes German submarines and approaches New York on a strange maiden voyage. Still unfinished, the vessel, the largest afloat, kept her voyage secret until well within American waters.
—Sweden is understood to have passed on to Finland peace terms offered by Moscow.
—Britain asserts her sea power by seizing and unloading more Italian ships carrying German coal.

MARCH 7—Rumors of a Russo-Finnish peace cause alarm in London, which fears a peace giving Russia and Germany domination over Finland, and hence Scandinavia, would help the Reich strategically and economically, free the Soviet for adventures in the Balkans and injure Allied prestige.
—Camouflaged and carrying a device to safeguard her from magnetic mines, the liner *Queen Elizabeth* ties up at a New York pier.

MARCH 8—With the arrival of former President Svinhufvud of Finland in Berlin there is increasing evidence that Germany is intervening to bring about a Russo-Finnish peace.
—Italy appears to be veering more towards the side of the Reich and even of Russia as Chancellor Hitler suddenly sends Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop to Rome, presumably to consult on the Italian war attitude in view of the British seizure of German coal cargoes.
—Under-Secretary of State Welles talks with French leaders in Paris.

MARCH 9—Britain releases Italian coal ships in exchange for Rome's promise not to send any more vessels to neutral ports for German coal during the war.
—Britain and France suddenly emphasize their readiness to intensify aid to Finland if Sweden and Norway allow passage of their troops. It is rumored that direct Finnish-Russian peace talks are going on in Moscow.
—As the Red army pours thousands of men into the fighting line in an attempt to encircle Viborg, the Finns slowly retreat.
—Under-Secretary of State Welles confers in France with heads of the Polish Government-in-Exile.

MARCH 10—It is confirmed that Finnish Premier Ryti is in Moscow negotiating for peace. The Red army deals smashing blows at the exhausted Finns.
—The British-Italian coal accord is said to have deflated the importance of a talk between von Ribbentrop and Mussolini.

MARCH 11—Prime Minister Chamberlain announces an offer to put "all available resources" at the disposal of the Finns—if they request help.
—German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop reputedly seeks the support of the Pope for a peace movement.
—Under-Secretary Welles obtains Britain's war views from Chamberlain and other British leaders.

MARCH 12—Premier Daladier tells the Chamber of Deputies that 50,000 French soldiers have been waiting since February 26 to go to the aid of Finland.
—In Berlin the reported termination of the Russo-Finnish conflict is interpreted as a victory for German diplomacy.

MARCH 13—Moscow announces that a peace treaty with Finland was signed at 2:30 A.M., with hostilities to cease at noon, ending the undeclared war that began with the Russian invasion of Finland on November 30. Peace terms, more drastic than Russia's demands last October, give the Soviet a lease on Hangoe, the entire Karelian Isthmus, a vital sector thrusting into Finland's waist and all the shores around Lake Ladoga, be-

sides free access through Petsamo in the Arctic, to Norway, and access to Sweden over a railway to be built from Kandalaksha in Northern Russia to Kemijaervi in Northern Finland.
—In the House of Commons former War Secretary Hore-Belisha denounces Britain's "inaction" in Finland.
—Finland urges Norway and Sweden to form a Scandinavian defense bloc.
—President Roosevelt, praising the valor of the Finns, scores Soviet Russia.
—It is announced that Italy has constructed her equivalent of the French Maginot Line and the German Westwall in the Brenner Pass, and along the French, Swiss and Yugoslav borders.

MARCH 14—It is reported in Berlin that Germany has obtained a pledge from Russia to spare Rumania, no matter what happens in the Balkans.
—Finland is faced with the problem of evacuating more than 100,000 people from districts seized by Russia.
—Premier Daladier answers questions regarding his Finnish policy at a secret session of the French Senate.

MARCH 15—Finland's Parliament ratifies peace treaty with Russia, 145-3, after Premier Ryti announces that Allied aid would have arrived too late.
—Supporters of a Finnish-Swedish-Norwegian defense pact press for quick action.

MARCH 16—Rumania is reported barring Nazi plan to pledge borders as the conditions of the "security" offer are called "intolerable and impossible to accept".
—Under-Secretary of State Sumner Welles confers with King Victor Emmanuel, Premier Mussolini and Count Ciano.

MARCH 17—President Roosevelt lays down the basic terms for a "real peace": small nations must be freed from economic domination or fear of attack by big neighbors; huge armies must be abolished and the international exchange of ideas and the right to worship must be unfettered.
—Mussolini leaves Rome for Brennero, where he will meet Hitler.

MARCH 18—Reichsfuehrer Hitler and Premier Mussolini enter into conference at Brennero, Italy.
—Berlin claims the formation of a three-power entente including Germany, Italy and Russia, while Rome placed the principal emphasis of the Mussolini-Hitler talk on the possibilities of peace.

MARCH 19—London Parliament holds inquest on Finland. Chamberlain denies Allies failed Finland; charges Nazis threw terror into Scandinavia.
—Under-Secretary of State Welles leaves Rome for Genoa on last leg of trip.

MARCH 20—British bombers in retaliation for last week-end's raid on Scapa Flow, attack the Nazi air base at Hoernum on the North Sea island of Sylt.

B'nai B'rith

(Continued from page 27)

ment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

A final word, too, must be added about the official organ of B'nai B'rith, *The National Jewish Monthly*. Its articles and news features are written by leading personalities in literature and scholarship, and the *Monthly* has taken its place as one of the great journals of Jewish opinion.

Heading the five hundred lodges with their more than one hundred thousand members, is a brilliant, dynamic Nebraskan, Henry Monsky, who was elected president in 1938, in his forty-seventh year. Born and bred in the Middle West, trained in the law, mellowed by a family background mainly identified with traditional Judaism, Monsky represents the new leadership which is gradually assuming responsibility for the institutional life of American Israel.

For more than twenty years he has served on the Executive Committee of B'nai B'rith and has been one of the spearheads of its expanding program. He is not an orator; he does not rely upon spellbinding for his effectiveness. But few men in Jewish life can match him in a conference or in negotiations. Again and again he has gone into important conferences, where heated argument over policy or program has apparently wrecked all hope for agreement. Monsky's calm, dispassionate appraisal of relevant factors, his clear view of alternatives, his suaveness in moving over rough spots, have often rescued a settlement.

Monsky took over the presidency of a century old organization, but he respects no policy or technique simply because it is old. It must demonstrate its right to serve in a world of perpetual change. Since his assumption of presidential authority the structure of B'nai B'rith has been streamlined. The membership has nearly doubled. The prestige of the order has vastly increased. The new extension departure in the Hillel Foundations was enthusiastically encouraged by the new president. A long step was taken under his leadership in creating a Joint Council to coordinate the defense activities of the major American Jewish organizations, to avoid overlapping and to increase efficiency.

Under Monsky's leadership B'nai B'rith, on the threshold of its second century, looks confidently to the future. The United States has now become the most important center of Jewish life, in numbers, in morale, in financial strength, in prestige. B'nai B'rith is ready to face the challenges of the new world with the same resiliency, the same dedication to the common good, which characterized the first century of its history.

Sweden: Her Tragic Dilemma

(Continued from page 18)

spread unanimity among the Swedish people. It seemed actually possible that, given the scale of the country and the population, the Swedes might succeed in resolving the fundamental paradox of the age of the machine. They were very little concerned with ideological differences and disputes.

Swedish intellectuals of either the right or the left had never troubled themselves over the Russian experiment. They held the sensible opinion, almost from the first, that the character of the Soviet state would inevitably be more Russian than Socialist. It was a tragedy, they felt, that the experiment of Socialism in the mass should come first to a feudal country with an enormous peasantry only a little removed from serfdom. Happily there was never any preoccupation in Sweden with the distractions and confusions of Stalinist and Trotskyist policy; there was no absorption in the mysteries of Russian performance and intention, as with so many American intellectuals.

Instead, the Swedes worked for social progress through democratic methods, seeking always to extend democratic controls by such means as the cooperatives. And they had achieved a considerable social advance. Even before the present wars in Europe began this advance had been slowed up. There was a general realization of the need for a pause in which preparedness should come first. Now, of course, there is a full stop. The hope is that in a distant future the forces of progress once again will be able to move forward.

The Reality of International Law

(Continued from page 15)

the practice on the theory for interfering with all German exports—the theory of "reprisals." The English Government says that if Germany breaks one rule of international law, the British are entitled to break another. Since the days of Thomas Jefferson, we have properly insisted that they can't legally do that at the expense of neutrals. Italy has recently made a strong protest along the same lines because of British interference with shipments of German coal to Italy. It is always difficult at the time to know which side first committed a breach of the law because both sides are likely to cloak illegalities under the convenient robe of reprisal for the acts of the enemy. When the war first broke out, we were reminded daily in the papers and over the radio that news from Europe was censored. This was a warning not to believe everything you read or heard. We still need it.

Statement of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Acts of Congress of August 24, 1912, and March 3, 1933.

of Current History, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for April 1, 1940

State of New York } ss.
County of New York }

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared E. Trevor Hill who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of Current History and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit: 1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business manager are: Publisher, C-H Publishing Corporation, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.; Editors, John T. Hackett, E. Trevor Hill, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.; Managing Editor, None; Business Manager, E. Trevor Hill, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) C-H Publishing Corporation, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. Stockholders: Madison Publishing Co., Inc., 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.: (E. Trevor Hill, John T. Hackett, Robert Strausz-Hupe); World Reviews, Inc., 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.) (The Foreign Observer, Inc., whose stockholders are Walker Matheson, I. Harvey Williams) 3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None. 4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him. Signed, E. Trevor Hill, Business Manager. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of March, 1940. (Seal) Edith M. Hemala, Notary Public. (My commission expires March 30, 1940.)

In so brief a sketch of a big subject, one has to make a number of broad statements which lawyers would qualify with "ifs" and "whereases," and also omit many interesting topics, the case of the Japanese steamer *Asama Maru*, for instance, from which a British warship took off twenty-one Germans on their way home via Vladivostock. There were a number of similar cases during the World War and the United States protested, usually with success. The papers now report that Great Britain has returned to Japan nine of the Germans—men whose status was doubtful—but there is little doubt of the right of a belligerent to take off men who are actually members of the armed forces of the enemy or even reservists.

There are also many interesting questions connected with aerial warfare. From the humanitarian point of view one would gladly prohibit aerial bombing entirely, but international law has not attempted the impossible. When the United States took the lead in a futile effort to agree upon a treaty covering this question in 1922, American experts suggested that it was entirely legal to bomb munitions factories, railroads used for transporting troops, and similar "military objectives" even though civilians might incidentally be killed. One of the few limitations which international law clearly imposes on aerial bombardment today is that it may not be used solely for the purpose of destroying or terrorizing the civilian population. Here, as in other cases of rules regulating actual conduct of hostilities, international law reaches the limit of practical agreement rather than the limit of humanitarian ideals. This is not an elevating or noble theory.

Yellow Peril

(Continued from page 30)

In the past, smaller countries, with little or no gold, have based their currencies upon the British pound sterling. They have in effect made their money redeemable in pounds rather than in gold. Great Britain gave up trying to maintain a fixed gold value for the pound when war broke out. Now the Argentine peso, the Canadian dollar, the Japanese yen and the Swedish krona are based on the United States dollar.

For the present, this is a handicap. The dollar is "strong," as financiers say, which means that it is expensive in terms of other nations' money—our goods are expensive to foreigners and our exports suffer—though this effect is masked for the present by war orders.

The dangers of the near future are unpredictable. But, looking farther ahead, it is possible that the United States, as the prime owner of gold, with the only important gold currency, may become the world's banker, and the dollar the currency of many countries, the great trade medium of the world.

Saving the Soil

(Continued from page 45)

Investigation immediately after the rain revealed that, while considerable flood damage had been done in neighboring watersheds, no flood had occurred in Gilmore Valley. Many streams had gone out of their banks, while Gilmore Creek had no more than half filled its normal channel.

Further, it was found that while rock washes had deposited sand, rock, and debris on roadways in nearby watersheds, the roadways along Gilmore Creek were free of such obstruction. These results seem even more striking when it is considered that before erosion control work was started, one to three feet of rock and sand were invariably deposited on Gilmore Valley roads after rains of much less intensity than this one. Small drainage areas within the watershed which were completely covered by contour strip-cropping lost practically no water during the rain. Brush dams placed in gullies draining strip-cropped areas gave evidence that only a trickle of water had passed over them, clearly indicating that most of the rain had been held on the land above.

As a "show-window" for soil conservation farming practices, the Gilmore Valley project has been, and continues to be, highly successful. Thousands of people have visited the area since the project's beginning—farmers, business men, college professors, farm organization leaders, even visitors from foreign lands.

The project has become a focal point for a spread of soil-saving methods. There are now more than 200 districts in the United States, covering nearly 120,000,000 acres which are fostering a new type of cooperation between farmers and their state and federal governments. Through these districts, farmers reach out to trained government workers for help in the solution, not only of erosion problems, but also of problems of submarginal land, flood control, farm forestry, and individual farm economics. Gilmore Valley has been a leader in this movement which, month by month, assumes more significant proportions. Gilmore Valley's project has become a window through which visitors glimpse a new era of wise and prosperous farming.

Great Britain's Ironside

(Continued from page 23)

footing politicians. That he has no battle victories to his name but rather a series of brilliant rear-guard actions on many Imperial fronts is no short-coming in the eyes of his countrymen. In this war, England is grimly determined to defend her vast possessions but also to spare her strength.

But Ironside, the stern Scot, is also Ironside the Cosmopolite who knows the ways of foreigners. He is at ease with the French generals. He is on the best of terms with Gustave Gamelin, the French generalissimo and Commander in Chief of the Allied Forces, who is a great strategist and a calm philosopher, who speaks little and dislikes publicity. A strange pair are they: the huge Scot, agile and loquacious; the tiny Frenchman, deep and taciturn; teamed in the common task of fighting a war.

AS CC
F.R.

Holland Looks to Her Dikes

(Continued from page 20)

fields that have been reclaimed one at a time from the ocean, rivers, lakes and marshes.

Since every polder has its own water level and is shut off by its own dikes, every polder that lies on the inundation line stretching from Muiden on Ijssel Lake southward through central Holland would have to be flooded separately. Therein lies the virtue of the Dutch water defense system: it can be controlled.

The Dutch would not be called upon to blow up dikes indiscriminately and let the water flow where it might. They could bring the water to any desired polders in their lowlying districts and, since most of the water would come from the well-stored Ijssel Lake, to any desired height. A few inches of water on top of the polders, however, are all the Dutch desire.

Much of the flooding would be accomplished not by blowing up dikes but by opening sluice gates. The lowest polders would be covered with water from higher ones adjacent to them, these in turn with water from still higher polders or nearby rivers. So important are the complete details that at any Army Exhibition staged by the Dutch General Staff at The Hague last summer machine guns, anti-aircraft guns, tanks, truck corps, and entrenchments were shown to the public and explained—but no information was given out on inundation methods.

Despite the fact that this water defense inevitably enters into every discussion about Holland's relation to the war, that country is made secure by a much more important weapon—the character of its people.

The Netherlands, contrary to popular belief, is not a homogeneous nation. Netherlanders are by nature strongly individualistic. In times of peace they oppose each other constantly and bitterly through fifty different religious sects, more than thirty different political parties, and at least five distinct levels of society. Cities rival cities, as do Amsterdam and The Hague. Provincial capitals and surrounding rural districts antagonize each other, as do Groningen, the city, and Groningen, the province.

Even in language there is no unity. A shopkeeper in Leiden speaks differently from a shopkeeper in Rotterdam. A farmer in Brabant has a different accent than a farmer in North Holland. In Friesland the people speak two languages: Dutch, in their own fashion, and a cherished Frisian tongue that can be understood even in some parts of southern Russia. All of these diversities in an area one two-hundred-and-fiftieth the size of the United States, or approximately the size of Maryland!

One thing, however, joins all Dutch people together, an inherent love of freedom—political freedom, religious freedom, freedom (if you will) to fight among themselves. For this the rugged Batavians, original inhabitants of the Rhine delta (today Holland's orchard country), finally drove out their Roman conquerors. For this the men, women and children of Haarlem, Leiden, Alkmaar fought side by side on the walls of their cities in the sixteenth century, resisting the siege of cruel, redoubtable Spanish troops under the Duke of Alva. For this they went without food, ate the rats out of the canals, the leaves off the trees—and finally broke their river dikes to flood the enemy out of the country. For this, Dutch troops fought against Napoleon at Waterloo.

Whenever their freedom is threatened the Dutch people lay aside their individual differences, forget dogmas, ignore conflicting ideologies and stand in unified loyalty behind their leaders.

Thus in 1935, when Europe was at peace, the anti-House-of-Orange Dutch Nazi party was able to obtain 8 per cent of the votes cast at the national elections. Last year, with Europe on the verge of war, and Holland the alleged first objective of a powerful German military machine, the same party polled only 4 per cent of the votes.

On election day the writer spoke with a member of the dwindling Dutch National Socialist party, a man who kept two portraits of Hitler in his home, none of Queen Wilhelmina. Even after Germany's absorption of Czecho-Slovakia he had proclaimed himself to be a Nazi sympathizer. But when asked what his feelings would be if Hitler's troops should invade Holland he replied without hesitation: "I would be the first Dutchman on the border—to shoot east."

He has lost the best habit in the world

...the habit of reading books!

ELIASCHEFF

"I just can't find any time to read books," he is always saying to his friends.

Yet... **IF HE SPENT (ON AN AVERAGE) ONLY 30 MINUTES A DAY—BEFORE BEDTIME, OR WHILE TRAVELLING TO OR FROM WORK, OR IN OTHER LEISURE MOMENTS—HE COULD EASILY READ EVERY BEST-SELLER DURING THE YEAR, AND A GREAT DEAL MORE!**

THERE has rarely been a period in American literature when more interesting books — fiction as well as non-fiction — were being written. You miss them constantly, and admit it regretfully whenever you talk about books. You blame it upon the distractions, the many interests which steal your time. But (if you analyze it honestly) your trouble is not lack of time. More likely you have simply gotten out of the habit of reading books.

Do you realize that (even if you read slowly) an average of *only half an hour a day* would have enabled you to read, within the past few months, all of the following widely-discussed new books:

NATIVE SON *by Richard Wright*
KITTY FOYLE *by Christopher Morley*
THE NAZARENE *by Sholem Asch*
PORTRAIT OF JENNIE *by Robert Nathan*
THE GRAPES OF WRATH *by John Steinbeck*
MOMENT IN PEKING *by Lin Yutang*
ESCAPE *by Ethel Vance*
THE STAR-GAZER *by Zsolt de Harsanyi*
THE TREES *by Conrad Richter*
A SMATTERING OF IGNORANCE *by Oscar Levant*
COUNTRY LAWYER *by Bellamy Partridge*
WIND, SAND AND STARS *by Antoine de Saint Exupéry*
DAYS OF OUR YEARS *by Pierre van Paassen*

— CONTINUED ON OTHER SIDE

ITLER STUNS EUROPE!

omas E. Dewey Sen. Robert A. Taft Harold J. Laski 25¢

CURRENT HISTORY

AMERICA! BEWARE A NAZI GREENLAND

By Col. Henry Breckinridge

SWEDEN'S DILEMMA · THE AMERICAN PRESIDENCY

BATTER UP! · STORM OVER THE BALKANS

WHO IS WINNING THE WAR?—GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

"GIVE MY BEST TO THE FOLKS"

"Hope to be seeing you soon." . . . "Gee, it's swell to hear your voice." . . . "We're all well here."

No great words of business or state are these—just the homey, every-day conversations that are America. The thoughts and hopes and remembrances that bind families and friends together. The flow of understanding that helps to make this a united nation.

Always the Bell System stands ready to help—to do its part quickly, cheaply, courteously, in the manner of a friend.

The World Today in Books

NORMAN COUSINS

THERE is a unique footnote to the mass blood-letting which is currently occupying European civilization. It is a book called *Failure of a Mission (Putnam, $3.00)*, and it is written by Sir Nevile Henderson, who spent three years as the representative of His Majesty in Berlin in a futile attempt to persuade Mr. Hitler to cancel out the factor of imperialism from the equation of Nazi dynamics.

The result of this failure is now designated as World War II, and Mr. Henderson has written this book in an effort to prove that, although the failure may be Britain's the guilt is Germany's. In effect, then, his book seeks to demonstrate the distinction between "failure" and "guilt." It pictures Britain as the earnest but unsuccessful seraph whose olive branch was offered without avail; and Germany as the stubborn, power-crazed recreant whose blindness carried it headlong into war.

We take it that the purpose of this book is to make these two pictures as clear to the reader as it appears to have been to Mr. Henderson. And yet the underlying significance of the book—for Americans, at least—is not in its purpose or theme but in its sidelights. As a message it is merely noteworthy, but as autobiography it is superb. When Mr. Henderson talks of his personal experiences in the German capital; when he discusses leading Nazis as personalities; when he tells stories behind the headlines, he provides us with an attention-riveting tale.

Nevile Henderson, like Winston Churchill, Duff Cooper, and many other British statesmen back through history, is endowed with considerable literary talent. He writes with great clarity and effectiveness, and calls subtly into play all the tools and tricks of an accomplished literary craftsman. His sketchas of Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Ribbentrop, *et al.*, are brilliant, fascinating. Hitler was a temperamental spellbinder—"a sort of Mahomet with a sword in one hand and *Mein Kampf* in the other"; Goering, whom Henderson liked and who comes off better than any of the other Nazis, was a "hospitable host and sportsman" who had a "Falstaffian sense of humor" but who was "a brutal buccaneer"; Goebbels, in appearance and character, was a "typical little Irish agitator"—probably the "most intelligent, from a purely brain point of view"; Ribbentrop, who is the arch villain of Henderson's piece, was "ill-mannered, ill-informed, vain, short-sighted, and always mistook rudeness for strength"; Hess was "a sort of adopted son to Hitler," probably Der Fuehrer's actual choice for his successor, and the bearer of a "strong fanatical streak."

Henderson saw and spoke to Hitler perhaps a dozen times. Almost invariably the German ruler was aflame with indignation; one time it was over German sailors killed in Spanish waters; another time it was over the accident to the dirigible Hindenburg, which Hitler seemed to indicate was the work of sabotage; other times it was over supposed atrocities suffered by Sudeten or Polish Germans. Only once or twice was Henderson able to talk to Der Fuehrer, whom he found "the slave of his own growing megalomania," under ordinary circumstances. But each time Henderson came away more puzzled than ever by the secret of Hitler's hold over the German people. He was baffled by Hitler's immense lack of intellectual equipment and his superficialities, but finally reasoned that the answer to the mystery was twofold: first, the Germans are submissive to authority and indeed, love it; second, Hitler symbolizes the Nazi Party and if he were superseded by another Nazi it might mean the destruction of the Party.

Reading between the lines, it ap-

"Silk Stockings in the Morning? Imagine!"

SILK stockings a luxury? Not today, but they were 25 years ago. So was an automobile, and a telephone. An incandescent lamp, not half so good as the one you now get for 15 cents, then cost more than twice as much. And you couldn't buy a radio or an electric refrigerator for love or money.

These are only a few of the things we accept today as commonplace. We expect wide, smooth, well-lighted streets. We want automatic heat in our homes; we clean our rugs with vacuum cleaners. When we go to the dentist we expect him to use an electric drill; we accept without comment an X-ray examination as part of a medical check-up. Luxuries? Not at all; they're part of the American standard of living.

How did they become common in so short a time? Not by some sudden change in our wealth and habits. It was through years of steady work by American industry—scientists, engineers, skilled workmen—developing new products, improving them, learning to make them less expensive so that more millions of people could enjoy them. And so, imperceptibly, they have changed from luxuries to necessities.

More than any other one thing, the increasing use of electricity in industry has helped in this progress. For more than 60 years, General Electric men and women have pioneered in making electricity more useful to the American people—have led in creating More Goods for More People at Less Cost.

G-E research and engineering have saved the public from ten to one hundred dollars for every dollar they have earned for General Electric

pears that Henderson's attitude toward Hitler, even in his presence, stemmed out of the quiet contempt at which the English are particularly adept. He exercised typical and traditional British restraint when talking to Hitler, with one or two exceptions (the presence of Ribbentrop, who unfailingly needled the austere Henderson out of his shell of reserve, was responsible for these exceptions), and it is easy to see that Mr. Hitler was always at least slightly aware that Mr. Henderson viewed him out of eyes whose barely raised brows gave just the smallest suspicion of scorn.

But if Mr. Henderson disliked Mr. Hitler and Mr. Ribbentrop, he found a responsive and likeable person in Hermann Goering. If Goering had been in the saddle, he says more than once, the world might still be at peace. Goering had had the educational training and social background lacked by the other high Nazis; he was a charming, refined, and correct host; one of Europe's leading sportsmen. All in all, Henderson *could* understand Goering, whereas it is clear that he could *not* understand the others. This is strongly significant, because it apparently helps to explain his repeated failures to anticipate the war storms whose warnings apparently everyone saw but the British leaders themselves. Goering represented to Henderson the type of Nazism against which Britain would never have gone to war. Goering's Nazism was reasonable in its excesses and, most importantly, it was not an *imperialistic* Nazism. But Hitler's Nazism was, and Mr. Henderson was never able to realize that it is as impossible to have a selective Nazism as it is to have a storm without a wind. For Nazism, as Herman Rauschning, once a high Nazi himself, demonstrated so convincingly in *The Revolution of Nihilism*, is a mighty torrent which completely engulfs its own tributaries.

And even today, it appears that Nevile Henderson is unable to convince himself concerning the dynamism permeating every fibre of Nazism. "The world would have acclaimed Hitler as a great German if he had known when and where to

May CURRENT HISTORY 1940

Contents

THE WAR IN EUROPE

Nazis in Greenland . . . . . *Colonel Henry Breckinridge* 13

Hitler Invades Scandinavia! . . . . *Hugh M. Cole* 15

A Plan for Europe's Cockpit . . . . . *Gabor de Bessenyey* 18

SPOTLIGHT ON THE PRESIDENCY

The Runaway Budget . . . . *Thomas E. Dewey* 21

The Issues in 1940 . . . . *Senator Robert A. Taft* 23

"Cord" Hull: Tennessee Statesman . . . . . *Fred Hixson* 24

Qualifications for the Presidency . . . . . . *Harold J. Laski* 28

Mrs. Smith Goes to Chicadelphia . . . . *Gordon Hamilton* 31

GENERAL ARTICLES

Bata at Belcamp . . . . *Alfred Henderson* 33

Friends at Work . . . . *Arthur Pound* 37

Batter Up! . . . . *Richards Vidmer* 41

HISTORY IN THE MAKING 6

THEY SAY 43

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? . . . . . *George V. Denny, Jr.* 50

CHRONOLOGY 54

BOOKS . . . . *Norman Cousins* 1

COVER DRAWING BY JOSEPH ALLORO

° ° °

Editors: JOHN T. HACKETT, E. TREVOR HILL
Associate Editor: ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE
Advertising Manager: JOHN A. CURTIS
Circulation Manager: FRED ROSEN
Editorial Assistants: ROGER STRAUS, JR., LOIS HALL, NATHALIE OSBORN

Current History, Volume LI, No 9, May, 1940 Whole No 304 Published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation Publication office, 29 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass.; New York office, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. E. Trevor Hill, President; John T. Hackett, Vice-President; Anne Roane, Secretary; I. Harvey Williams, Treasurer. John A. Curtis, Advertising Manager. 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Central and South America and Spain; Canada 50c a year additional; elsewhere $1.25 a year additional. Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance. Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned. Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1939, at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879. Entered in Canada as second-class matter. Printed in U. S. A.

MEMORANDUM FOR LIBRARIANS:

CURRENT HISTORY indexes are published in the last number of each volume.
Beginning with the present volume, 51, every volume will have twelve numbers and will run from September through August. The complete index for the volume will be in the August issue.

stop," says Henderson in his introduction. He adds that "dictatorships are not always evil . . . and there are, in fact, many things in the Nazi organization and social institutions, as distinct from its rabid nationalism and ideology, which we might study and adapt to our own use with great profit. . . ."

Shades of appeasement! Was this not the key to the "failure" of his "mission"? Was he unable to perceive that Nazism was indivisible, the good chained to the bad, that the bad was always more of a force than the good and therefore always dominated it; and the labor camps for the young he praised so highly were no more than a first cousin to the concentration camps he hated so violently?

And yet Mr. Henderson several times in his book gives way to observations which make you wonder if he himself does not recognize the contradictions. For example, musing on the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde nature of Adolf Hitler, he reflects that dictators, after all, lose their sense of proportion, their every success leading to ever expanding aims, while their insatiable desire for their own permanence drives them in the end to put self before country. *Sic semper tyrannis.*

If this be true, why didn't Britain recognize the end product of Nazism for what it was early in the game, before the means had become established? Can it be that Britain had taken Hitler's protestations of anti-Bolshevism at face value and had hoped that a Hitlerized Germany would be a geographically convenient cushion against any possible pressure from the East? Mr. Henderson's book throws no light on this point and is perhaps even conspicuously silent. But he does admit the considerable surprise and disappointment felt by Britain when Germany bought off Russia at the eleventh hour.

International politics knows no rules and nowhere is the full range of its mendacity and schemery brought into bolder relief than in Mr. Henderson's book. For whether he likes it or not, he has written an indictment of European diplomacy, British as well as German or Russian or Italian; and the war he had hoped to prevent is as much the result of the breakdown of the entire post-World War conduct of diplomacy, and the abdication of responsibility by Great Britain and France, as it is the result

of Nazism itself, which Mr. Henderson seemed to persist in believing could be maneuvered in directions not incompatible with British interests.

If you read this book as autobiography and not as doctrine you will have a rare glimpse into that vague sphere of international relations which usually revolves on an orbit far beyond the ken of ordinary man. You will become convinced of the foibles and mistakes of the men who are entrusted with the task of running this world; you will be tempted to think that you yourself might have done a better job of it, and perhaps you will be right. You will realize, too, that if it be human to err, then dictators are the most humanized beings in the world. And if there is any lesson to be learned, it is that dictators and dictatorships cannot be approved under certain circumstances and disapproved under others, unless we are ready to divorce form from substance.

For supplementary background reading to *Failure of a Mission,* this department suggests Malcolm Muggeridge's *The Sun Never Sets (Random House $3.00),* a colorfully-written and broad-stroked account of the last ten years in the history of the British Empire. Mr. Muggeridge, London newspaperman, has attempted to piece together the frequently disperse strands of the 'thirties and to piece them together in a pattern having the advantage of perspective. Actually, his pattern is much broader and much more varied than that of the Empire alone, for when he is through it develops that he has written a history of a decade in the life of a continent—or even the world.

Mr. Muggeridge's is a vignette technique which throws a spotlight on apparently insignificant and unrelated events or personalities, integrating them into the whole. The nearest thing we have to it in America is Frederick Lewis Allen's flavorful *Since Yesterday* or *Only Yesterday,* the histories of two decades in American life.

The Sun Never Sets is not a respectful book. There is hardly a page in it unadorned with a petard on which a British institution or tradition or office-holder is not hoisted. It is somewhat skeptical of the extent to which Englishmen enjoy their theoretical democracy and freedom, and Mr. Muggeridge asks whether, in fighting to retain that freedom, they may not be fighting for an elusive quality or even an abstraction. Yet this book, it seems to us, offers proof that the freedom of Englishmen is more than an abstraction.

By the time this review appears, the war spotlight may have shifted from Scandinavia to the Near East, where war rumblings have been ominously sounding these last few months and where the Allied forces have concentrated a large army. A good background book to have on hand for an understanding of any present or new developments in that region is *Turkey at the Straits (Macmillan $2.00),* by James T. Shotwell and Francis Deak. Tracing the history of the Straits—that connecting link between Europe and Asia which also joins the Black and Mediterranean Seas—the authors examine the attempts of powers back as far as the Greeks to dominate the Straits. "Once more," they say, "the supreme strategic importance of the control of the Straits is abundantly evident. The impending crisis involves also Turkey's neighbors in the Balkans who would have to be overpowered before either Germany or Russia could effectively challenge Turkish control."

This department commends to both Democratic and Republican parties, in their search for a sensible and streamlined 1940 platform, Shelby Cullom Davis' *America Faces the Forties (Dorrance $2.75).*

Even more valuable than its predecessor, the *Living Age* annual *The World Over, 1939 (Harrison-Hilton $4.00),* is a concise, meaty, immensely handy reference guide to the events of last year. For the convenience of the reader, it is divided into two broad sections, "commentary" and chronology. The commentary is an objective, well-knit running account, country by country and month by month; and the chronology is a terse day-by-day record, also country by country. As a whole, this volume, which is free from prejudice, establishes the annual series as one of the truly indispensable tools for anyone who has more than a passing interest in foreign affairs.

The World Over is edited by Leon Bryce Bloch, editor of the *Living Age,* and Charles Angoff, with the assistance of Lamar Middleton, Walker Matheson, William D. Allen, Allan Angoff and Stephen Naft.

Blitzkrieg

Stalemated for thirty-one weeks on the Western Front, the European war early in April suddenly spread to engulf Denmark and Norway.

The first public intimation of Germany's hammer blow at Scandinavia —one of the most efficient and venturesome sea and land operations in modern military history—came on April 8 with the sinking of a Nazi troop ship by a British submarine off southern Norway and Danish reports of a German armada steaming up the Skagerrak towards the jagged Norwegian coast.

Two days earlier, both Denmark and Norway, through statements of their Premiers, had indicated their intention of maintaining neutrality and keeping out of the war. Then, on the morning of April 8, the Allies announced that they had mined three areas in neutral Norwegian waters to prevent German vessels from using them for the transport of vital Swedish iron ore. The Allied announcement sought to justify this action as a "lawful" reprisal for the "illegal" German campaign against merchant shipping of all nations.

Next morning, at dawn, Adolf Hitler reached for his fourth and fifth great territorial conquests. Under the guise of "protecting" Denmark and Norway from the Allies, his forces overran Denmark almost without firing a shot and captured the principal ports of a defiant but bewildered Norway.

Allied Counter-Strokes

Thunderstruck at first by Hitler's blow in the North, the Allies nevertheless soon found, or pretended to find, cause for rejoicing in it. Hitler's action, said Winston Churchill, First Lord of the British Admiralty, "may prove as great a political and strategic error as that committed by Napoleon when he invaded Spain." And Churchill immediately announced that a large Allied expeditionary force would be sent out to Norway forthwith to drive out the German invaders as soon as it was humanly possible to do so.

In so far as the Allies' rejoicing was genuine, it was based on two thoughts: First, that Hitler's invasion of the Scandinavian Peninsula had given them a possible front for attack, other than the well-nigh impregnable German Westwall facing the French Maginot Line; secondly, it had afforded Britain an opportunity to come to grips with German forces on the sea, where the superiority of the British Navy is questioned by no one.

Soon Nazi warships and troop transports felt the deadly sting of Norwegian shore batteries and the might of the British fleet, suddenly amassed for what many believed would prove to be a second Battle of Jutland. It was at Jutland that, in the last World War, the Kaiser's Navy was completely swept from the seas.

Duffy, The Sun, Baltimore

Who else craves "Protection"?

War at Sea

In a matter of hours, naval battles were raging in the North Sea and in the Skagerrak-Kattegat areas around Denmark. The fighting continued for days. At the entrance to the Skagerrak, off the Jutland Bank, the British Grand Fleet under Admiral Jellicoe in May 1916 engaged the German High Seas Fleet under Admiral Scheer. The Germans sank more tonnage in that battle than the British did, but the net result of Jutland was that the German Navy stopped trying to blast a way through British sea power.

The final outcome of the naval battles following Hitler's invasion of Norway may not be known for weeks, so confusing were the clouds of propaganda that accompanied the smoke of battle. For days, in fact, the Germans refused to admit that any large-scale sea battle had taken place. They insisted that the occupation of Norway was proceeding according to schedule with little British interference.

On the other hand, British spokesmen went so far as to assert that British warships had not only invaded the German-controlled Baltic but had throttled German sea power by mining the Baltic on a wholesale scale from Sweden to the coast of Lithuania. Nazi spokesmen replied by stressing the damage their bombing planes had inflicted on British war craft and belittled Allied attempts to gain footholds on the western Norwegian shore.

On April 16, Premier Paul Reynaud set up the claim that, in eight days of fighting off Norway, 30 per cent of Germany's battle fleet had

been damaged, 20 per cent of her cruisers had been sunk and 25 per cent of her destroyers.

"The first great battle between Germany and the Allies has been a naval battle," he declared, "and the Allies have won."

Norway as Battlefield

More than a week elapsed before the main battle lines in Norway had clarified sufficiently for the outside world to comprehend them.

Oslo, Norway's capital, soon fell before the German invaders, and there the Nazi sympathizer, Major Vidkun Quisling, set up a pro-German government, later yielding to Ingolf Christensen. With King Haakon and his government fleeing from one town to another to avoid capture by German troops, the Nazis were aided at several points by traitorous Norwegians, particularly among the army officers.

One after another, the ports of Norway's western coast fell into Nazi hands, and wherever German troops took possession they promptly dug in, awaiting the expeditionary force with which, they knew, the Allies would attempt to dislodge them. By April 15, it was reported—from Allied sources—that French, Canadian and English troops had landed in Norway at "several places." The first German admission of such a landing came two days later. The British, Berlin conceded, had landed thirty miles north of Narvik.

From Narvik a railroad runs through the iron-producing regions of northern Sweden. Over that railroad, and from the port of Narvik, Swedish iron had been transported to Germany, and it was to stop the flow that the Allies had mined Norway's territorial waters. The strategic importance of Narvik quickly produced bitter battles to control it. On April 17, Peter C. Rhodes, *United Press* correspondent, who had witnessed the fighting, reported: "More than 1,000 German, Norwegian and British dead lie at the bottom of Narvik Harbor. The harbor itself is the graveyard of some forty German, British and Norwegian warships, and German, British, Norwegian and neutral merchant ships."

Half way up the coast of Norway is Trondheim, from which another railroad also leads to the Swedish ore fields. From Trondheim the Germans smashed east to the Swedish border

Fitzpatrick, St. Louis Post-Dispatch

I have a rendezvous with spring.

in an apparent attempt to cut Norway in two. One obvious purpose was to facilitate the job of mopping up isolated Norwegian strongholds in the southern part of the country.

By April 17th the German air force was utilizing its newly won bases in Norway for bombing expeditions against the British navy. But these raids brought violent reprisals. Off Stavanger, for example, British warships wheeled into position one morning and bombarded the German-held airport for eighty minutes, with one terrific salvo after another.

The Bloody Danube

Wild rumors filled the Balkans and flowed out to the rest of the world as German troops smashed into Scandinavia. There were stories that the Red army was massing across the border of the Rumanian province of Bessarabia, which belonged to Russia before the World War. As a step in preparation for possible war, Rumania put her Black Sea and Danube ports under the control of the navy. To meet the defense needs of the country, restrictions were placed on exports of grain and oil. Promptly the question arose of how seriously such restrictions would embroil Rumania with Germany. In Bucharest, certain streets were proclaimed military zones and residents were obliged to obtain identification papers.

Yugoslavia, also, intensified military preparations. There it was charged that police had discovered a Nazi conspiracy to overthrow the government. Squeezed between warring Germany and restless Italy, and with the Soviet Union looming over the Rumanian horizon, Yugoslavia had obvious reason to be uneasy.

A primary cause of Balkan nervousness was fear of a tremendous collision on a Balkan battleground between German troops and the half million men the Allies apparently

Mussolini, Meenie, Miney, Moe . . .

have massed in the Near East. Once again there was apprehension lest the Danube, "river of waltzes" but also of wars, might be the site of another vast conflict. From its source in the Black Forest in Southern Germany to its Rumanian delta in the Black Sea, the Danube has seen more wars than any other river in Europe. In this war, the Danube is a vital German supply route. Reports a few weeks ago that the British were attempting to block it with barges laden with dynamite were noted with chills of foreboding all over Europe.

Italy Girds—for What?

As the Balkan neutrals quivered with fear, there were signs that Italy might enter the war on the side of Germany. "The bugles will soon sound," declared Giovanni Ansaldo, newspaper editor who is close to the Fascist government. In the *Giornale D'Italia,* Virginio Gayda, widely known as Mussolini's mouthpiece, unleashed a strong editorial attack on France. He accused the French of trying to exert an anti-Italian influence on the foreign policy of Yugoslavia, and added: "French expansionism always had one aim—the rule of the Mediterranean; thus the French policy of hegemony has taken positions which are holding vital Italian interests in check."

The Gayda statement was followed by anti-British demonstrations in Italian cities, and it accompanied reports that Italy's fleet soon would be concentrated around the Dodecanese Islands, off the Turkish coast. This could be interpreted as a move to block any attempt of Allied fleets to steam through the Dardanelles into the Black Sea and cut off oil shipments from Russia to Germany. But some observers preferred to regard the whole Italian hubbub as an attempt to divert Allied attention to the Mediterranean from the blitzkrieg in Scandinavia.

While Mussolini pondered his future course, Ronald H. Cross, Britain's Minister of Economic Warfare, urged him to hurry and make up his mind. "We have no quarrel with Italy," he declared. "We have every wish to be friends. But we are a plain-dealing and plain-speaking people, and we should like to know where we stand."

Holland and the Indies

Aside from Scandinavia and southern Europe, there was a vital third danger spot as the flames of war began to curl around the nervous neutrals. That Nazi "protection" similar to that extended to Denmark and Norway might also be thrust upon the Dutch was intimated in Berlin when reports were published that Britain might attack Germany through the Netherlands. London denied these reports.

If Hitler should decide to do some "protecting" of his Dutch neighbors—and incidentally secure bases for lightning attacks upon England and Scotland—he will roll out two powder barrels on opposite sides of the world, both seriously affecting the United States.

The Netherlands is a close neighbor of the United States. The red-white-and-blue-barred flag of Holland flies over Dutch Guiana, sandwiched between British and French Guiana in South America, and over the Curacao chain of islands off Venezuela, with their large oil refineries.

Should Hitler "protect" the Netherlands and also win the war, he might conceivably lay claim to Holland's American possessions which, in the hands of a hostile power, would be a dangerous threat to the Panama Canal. There are already reports that The Hague will ask Washington to take the Dutch West Indies under its benevolent protection the minute Nazi troops march into Holland.

More serious by far is the problem of the Netherlands East Indies. While Holland itself has nine million inhabitants and is smaller than Massachusetts and Connecticut, the colonial possessions of the Netherlands in the Far East contain sixty million people sprawled over a territory more than sixty times the size of the mother country. If the Netherlands East and West Indies could be lumped together, they would represent a land mass larger than Ger-

many, France, Britain and Italy combined.

Thus, Nazi threats against Holland reverberated in far-off Tokyo when, on April 15, Foreign Minister Arita warned that any change of the political status of the East Indies would be "undesirable" and of "deep concern" to Japan. This warning against the spread of the European war to the Orient came on the heels of suggestions that the United States might well extend its benevolent protection to the East Indies as well as to the Caribbean, or that Britain might well do so. A third suggestion was that The Hague government might move, bag and baggage, to Batavia, capital of Java.

None of these proposals pleased Japan, particularly the suggestion that the United States take over. There have been repeated boycott threats in the United States against the Tokyo war machine—and Japan gets about 30 per cent of all her vital oil, all her tin, most of her rubber from the Indies. An anti-Japanese boycott in that area would be grave indeed. Nor was the proposal that Britain take over palatable, for Tokyo doubted that the British, once in would ever move out of this rich area. Finally, the prospect that the Netherlands government move into the islands was equally distasteful, for that would mean the firmer establishment of a purely European empire in the Orient, contrary to Japan's aim of creating an Asia for Asiatics.

On April 17, Secretary of State Hull declared that the position of the United States in regard to the Dutch East Indies was that the status quo must be maintained in all phases. President Roosevelt endorsed that statement next day, so that, in this matter, Tokyo and Washington are apparently in agreement.

Hungerford, The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

An isolationist cartoon showing "The Only Safe View to Take of the War."

U.S. Reactions

President Roosevelt went to Hyde Park a few weeks ago for rest and relaxation. He wanted to superintend the planting of several thousand evergreens on his Dutchess County acres, and to inspect the nearly completed library that will house his public papers. He ran into bad luck. He was awakened in the middle of the night to be told that Germany had invaded Denmark and Norway. A few hours later his special eight-car train was speeding him back to Washington, where he plunged at once into the feverish activity in the State Department.

When the Neutrality Act was revised last year and its prohibition against American ships and travelers entering the war zone was proclaimed, the Norwegian coast north of Bergen was not included. Now war had reached that coast. Quickly a new Presidential proclamation was issued barring Norwegian waters to American merchantmen. The State Department, however, had to find ways of getting home three American ships in Norwegian ports and had to consider the plight of more than 3,000 Americans in Scandinavia. The Treasury, until the situation abroad cleared, embargoed export of Danish and Norwegian funds in the United States.

Those problems tackled, Washington considered the larger aspects of Germany's action. At the White House the invasions were denounced with the words: "Force and aggression are once more on the march against small nations." At the Capitol, members of Congress, their isolationist sentiment strong, guarded their remarks, but there was evidence that attempts would be made to speed up the national armament program, particularly naval construction.

In the country as a whole, sympathy for the fate of Scandinavia was apparent. That part of Europe has contributed hundreds of thousands of its people to American life. Its democracy is admired in the United States. To see that democracy threatened was painful to Americans. In many minds the thought stirred that war was spreading, coming closer.

Economic Consequences

Whether the war would spread until eventually it broke against American shores was for time to tell. Meanwhile, the government, merchants and bankers had to study the Scandinavian adventure's immediate economic effect on the United States.

American investments in Norway, Sweden and Denmark total about $220,000,000. Their fate seemed uncertain. Trade with the three was sure to be crippled. In January and February exports to them totaled $30,618,000, imports $14,945,000.

Mussolini's Position

—Condensed from *The Daily Mirror*, New York

Factors which should keep Il Duce from teaming up with Hitler are:

1. Britain's control of Gibraltar. By shutting Gibraltar and the Suez Canal, Britain could cut off Italy's supplies of raw materials. With the exception of mercury, aluminum and tin, Italy must import every mineral used by her industrial machine. Italians themselves admit that 80 per cent of Italy's total raw material imports pass through Gibraltar and Suez.
2. The vulnerability of the Po Valley, in which Italy's industries are concentrated. The converging mountain passes favor a French invasion; it is only 35 miles from the border to Turin, and from there the French Army could press on to—
3. The Brenner Pass, backdoor to Germany. Significantly the Brenner is fortified only on the Italian side.
4. Yugoslavia: Cramped between Italy to the west and south (in Albania), and Germany to the north, the Yugoslavs might go along peaceably with Italy. But, backed by the Allied force of 500,000 men in the Near East, the hard-fighting Yugoslavs could be a dangerous thorn in Italy's side.
5. The Allied control of the Dardanelles, which bottles up Russia in the Black Sea. Little help could come to Catholic Italy from Communist Russia.
6. The isolation of Ethiopia, the Dodecanese Islands and Libya. War against the seapower of England and France would result in the break-up of Italy's hard won colonial empire, and cut off the mother country from 250,000 soldiers.

Hardest blow Italy could strike would be in the Western Mediterranean, where the life-lines of England, France and Italy criss-cross. But again, after the first flurry of Italian bombers (and the plane still has not proved it is the master of the battleship), the Allied fleets could keep their communication lines to their colonies open, while severing Italy's.

Victor Emmanuel, who knows how vulnerable the entire Italian Peninsula would be to Allied seapower, threatened to abdicate last September when there was talk that Mussolini would bring Italy into the war.

More important than this loss was the fact that the war's spread is steadily reducing American foreign markets, cutting off exports and imports alike, without the compensation of large-scale orders from the Allies for American products other than war materials.

The German blow to Scandinavia, it could be prophesied, would be felt in American ports, where the flags of Norway, Sweden and Denmark have been familiar. Norwegian freighters, Danish tramps, Swedish liners have been carrying freight and passengers to all ports of the world. The war's spread has hit them, and last month many lay idle at the docks, some presumably for the war's duration, others until the Allies might take them over and press them into war service.

Fate of Greenland

At a press conference after the German invasion of Scandinavia President Roosevelt told reporters that he had been reading about Greenland. Germany's seizure of Denmark raised the question of the status of the Danish colony. The United States is interested in this.

Marc' Aurelio, Rome

"Why do you baptize the ship with a torpedo?"

"In order to save time."

Despite its traditional iciness, Greenland's fjords might be converted into submarine bases. Air bases in Greenland might be possible, even though the sudden fogs that often sheath it do not make for easy flying. In German hands Greenland would pose a new problem in American defense as well as a challenge to the Monroe Doctrine. Germany's disavowal of any interest in the Danish colony did not lessen the concern felt by the American government.

The President's reading told him that Greenland was 1,300 miles from the United States, 300 miles from Canada; that the region, though much of it is perpetual ice and snow, has an area almost as large as Mexico; that the flora and fauna are definitely North American; that the Norsemen were there in the tenth century, under Eric the Red, and that they settled the country in succeeding generations.

In Greenland today is a population of about 17,000, most of whom are Eskimos. Their livelihood has depended on trade with Denmark, a long-time state monopoly. Annual supply ships from Denmark have kept the people going. Now these ships may not arrive. That fact led President Roosevelt to ask the American Red Cross to study Greenland's needs. This year the supply ships may be American.

American in Norway

Into a large house in Oslo's residential section excited men, women and children crowded early one morning a few weeks ago. They were Americans—the house was the American Legation. Once it had belonged to Nobel, of peace prize fame. Now there was no peace in Oslo. The Germans had come, and American diplomatic and consular families were seeking refuge. In full command was the American Minister, Mrs. J. Borden Harriman.

When Mrs. Harriman—to President Roosevelt and her friends she is "Daisy"—was appointed to the Oslo post in 1937, a full career was crowned with an honorary job whose duties were expected to be more social than diplomatic. Nothing was likely to happen at Oslo other than routine business, but Mrs. Harriman's experience would make her a charming Legation hostess and American representative.

In Washington she had been fa-

mous as a hostess. "Uplands," her estate, came to be known as a "tea-cup chancellery" where diplomats and poets, politicians and professors, gathered for talk and fellowship. Once she had figured in New York society. She left it, managed the New York Reformatory for Women at Bedford, served as an industrial relations expert in the Wilson Administration, organized an ambulance corps in the World War, and sat on the Democratic National Committee. Meanwhile she found leisure to write her autobiographical *From Pinafore to Politics.*

The Oslo post at first was leisurely. There was time for travel. On summer afternoons there were tea and talk on the Legation terrace that looked out upon the rose gardens Mrs. Harriman tended. Formal dinners and receptions filled the calendar. Then war broke, changing all.

The *City of Flint* affair last year kept Mrs. Harriman busy. Then the German invasion of Norway turned her life upside down. Though she will be seventy next July, she showed exceptional energy. Her word to Washington about what was happening in Oslo broke the news of the German invasion to the world. Her decision to remain with the fleeing Norwegian government led her into adventure.

Her car was in a procession that was gunned. She bunked in farmhouses with her staff, fled to the woods during air raids, ate sparsely of whatever could be had. All the while she tried to keep in communication with Washington, and remain as close as possible to the Norwegian government. In short, "Daisy" had a time of it. Americans were proud of the way she represented them.

Reg Manning, Arizona Republic

The Holdout

War and U.S. Politics

Ever since war clouds first loomed on the European horizon, American politicians have been asking: What would be the effect of a European war on American politics? Woodrow Wilson campaigned in 1916 on the "he-kept-us-out-of-war" issue. It cut deep into the campaign. Franklin D. Roosevelt might use war danger to telling effect in the 1940 contest.

To Republicans, anti-New Deal Democrats and anti-third-termers in both parties, the possibility that Mr. Roosevelt might not only seek a third term but be elected on the war issue has been a constant nightmare. Nor has the White House occupant done anything to end the dream. He has kept his own counsel, while many around him have urged the need for a third term.

Should Europe's war be in a critical stage this fall, an experienced hand would be needed on the national tiller, and what hand more experienced than Mr. Roosevelt's—so the argument has run. It was heard throughout the land as the lightning flashed across the sky from Scandinavia.

How telling the argument has been the presidential primaries to date do not conclusively reveal.

However, in New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Illinois and Nebraska, the name of the President, when placed against that of Vice-President Garner, his only open opponent, proved as magical as ever. Seasoned commentators reached this conclusion: the Democratic nomination is Mr. Roosevelt's if he wants it, or he can give it to anyone he selects. Who might he choose?

Secretary of State Hull? His experience with American foreign policy would seem to meet the war argument. Attorney General Jackson? He is a firm New Dealer, although politically he has been accused of unpopularity. Security Administrator McNutt? He has asked for leave from his post to campaign. Postmaster General Farley, Senator Wheeler of Montana? Mr. Roosevelt has not indicated how he felt toward any of them.

Dewey Bandwagon

Among Republicans who seek next June's Presidential nomination, the name of Thomas E. Dewey leads all the rest, now that he has won resounding victories over Senator Vandenberg in Wisconsin and Nebraska. Senator Taft of Ohio, an active contender, has stayed out of primary contests, and that policy keeps his candidacy a constant threat to others.

With the Dewey bandwagon moving happily along, demands began to be heard for an expression of foreign policy views from the young New Yorker. He has been quoted as an isolationist and as an "aid-the-Allies-short-of-war" man. On April 15, Mr. Dewey took the flat isolationist position of demanding that this nation be not involved "in any aspect of the war or any negotiations between the warring nations."

But in the purely political sense a barrier that might be important suddenly arose in the Dewey bandwagon's path.

New York Republicans, Dewey-controlled, chose a new state chairman, Edwin F. Jaeckle, and began a drive to end National Committee membership for Kenneth E. Simpson, an anti-Dewey New Yorker. A party fight loomed, with the likelihood that New York delegates at the Republican national convention would not be 100 per cent pro-Dewey. Such a feud might be important, for even if Mr. Simpson did not affect the party's nomination, he might affect the campaign result by taking an attitude similar to that in 1896 of David B. Hill, Democratic Governor of New York, who remarked after the Bryan nomination. "I am a Democrat still —very still."

Down Mexico Way

Through the Zocalo, Mexico City's great public square that the sixteenth century cathedral and the pink stone National Palace dominate, thousands of Mexicans paraded one day recently. From a palace balcony President Lazaro Cardenas watched. The demonstrators were out to prove, and not for the first time, that public opinion supports the Mexican government's oil policies.

Oil—"black gold"—has been the source of much Mexican trouble over many years. Back in the old days, when foreign companies exploited the oil fields, oil money was accused of running Mexican politics. Oil made a few men rich, but did little for the poor, so the charge went, and a growing sense of nationalism that resented foreign exploitation of natural resources compounded all charges. Two years ago last March 29, the Mexican government expropriated foreign oil properties.

Seizure loosed a diplomatic controversy between Mexico and the United States, and between Mexico

The Memphis Commercial Appeal

"Neutral? Who's neutral?"

and Britain, that has run on like an intermittent fever. Mexico's government agreed that the companies should be compensated. In Washington the right of any nation to expropriate property was upheld, so long as the property owners were compensated. It did not seem that the two countries were far apart in theory. But many observers wondered where Mexico, poverty stricken, would find the money to pay the oil companies.

There was a further stumbling block. How much were the oil properties worth? The question had to be answered before compensation would be possible. And what form should compensation take? It seemed that the dispute might be prolonged indefinitely, to the prejudice not only of the oil companies but of all American concerns in Latin-American nations.

A few weeks ago, the State Department at Washington spoke out. It protested against the failure of Mexico to provide compensation and urged that the whole business be submitted to arbitration. The strong tenor of the communication aroused Mexican patriotism, and while Mexican diplomats pondered over a formal reply the Mexican public demonstrated in the Zocalo.

Mrs. Taft, Campaigner

Republican women in Pennsylvania were told a few weeks ago that they were "tough in the best sense, full of courage and confidence and ready for a fight." The characterization came at the close of a Philadelphia luncheon for party stalwarts. The characterizer was Martha Bowers Taft, wife of Ohio's junior Senator, Robert Alphonso Taft.

For weeks Mrs. Taft had been journeying up and down the country, talking Taft and Republicanism. She wants her husband to be the next occupant of the White House. "I think he would be a good President," she has said. Observers have admitted that, in his witty, vivacious, intelligent wife, he would have a strong helpmate should next June's nomination and next November's election come his way.

Among the wives of the many Republican and Democratic hopefuls, only Mrs. Taft has participated actively in the pre-nomination campaign. It is a political habit of hers. In the old Ohio days, when the Tafts' chief distinction stemmed from membership in the William Howard Taft family, she aided her husband in his public efforts. When he ran for the Senate in 1938, she stumped the State for him and, if results mean anything, did a good job. "I enjoy politics," she remarked when the election returns had come in. "It is one of the things a wife and her husband can do together."

The Tafts have been married for more than a quarter century, and have four sons who now have nearly come to man's estate. Their home was a gentleman's farm outside Cincinnati until Senatorial duties brought Washington residence and the social life of the capital. Though the Senator, quiet, dignified, retiring, with little of his father's famous jollity, impresses groups in which the Tafts mingle, Mrs. Taft also has carried off real honors.

What she is today is probably the result of long experience in public life. Twenty years ago she helped to start the Cincinnati Women Voters on their way. Since then she has been prominent in the affairs of the National League of Women Voters, speaking before League gatherings in many towns and cities. "I am a feminist," she once admitted, "but not an extremist and I haven't heard any demand for a woman President, nor have I seen any women scrambling for the job."

Despite Mrs. Taft's interest in her husband's cause and her readiness to campaign for him, she tends to let the details of rounding up delegates, of organizing headquarters and the like, remain with the more professional politicians. She is the propagandist of a cause. The strategy that will lead to victory or defeat belongs to the High Command.

Nazis in Greenland

The United States should bar them from that Danish possession, this writer feels

COLONEL HENRY BRECKINRIDGE

BY conquest, the Nazi has seized Denmark. Denmark enjoys suzerainty over Iceland and sovereignty over Greenland.

Greenland, as we know, is east of the American continent, is 736,518 square miles in area and has a population of about 16,000 natives and 400 Danes. The area of Iceland, east of Greenland, is 39,709 square miles; its population is about 118,000.

Iceland and Greenland are the great stepping stones between Europe and the American continent for the modern giant, aviation. In the hands of neutral, peaceful, civilized Denmark, they are no menace. In the hands of Hitler, they are an intolerable threat to the security of the United States.

The Nazi has not yet reduced Iceland and Greenland to physical possession but has completely subjugated and occupied Denmark, the center of their political and international control. Though Iceland has home rule, its foreign relations are in the hands of Denmark. Since the Nazi invasion of Denmark, Iceland has proclaimed control of its own international relations. The Allied fleets alone give any effect to this proclamation of independence.

The use of these North Atlantic stepping stones for passage between the American and European continents is no theoretical projection of the imagination. Lindbergh, Balbo with his Italian Savoia-Marchettis, and, earlier, the army round-the-world fliers employed them. Europe, Iceland, Greenland, America—short hops for the noble eagles of modern aviation as well as for the devastating vultures loosed upon civilization by the crude type of tyrant now in control of vast millions of Europe's people.

The isolationist looks upon the broad sweep of Atlantic waters and the more vast stretches of the Pacific Ocean. Blindly confident that they give him security without much, if any, effort on his part, he views with a lofty condescension the life struggles of the other free peoples of the world. He even assumes a self-righteous impartiality, nicely weighing and balancing ancient wrongs of one against present crimes of the other. He discounts the blood lust and power lust of the conquering dictator as the helpless victims expire or writhe under the iron heel. He rather excuses the machine gun rapid fire dishonoring of the plighted word by explaining it as just an increasing tempo of perfidy as compared with the dishonors of other empires in a slower age.

> COLONEL HENRY BRECKINRIDGE, lawyer and aeronautical expert, was Assistant Secretary of War from 1913-1916. For ten years he was a director of Transcontinental and Western Airlines.
>
> In the World War he participated in the Vosges, Battle of St. Mihiel, and Meuse-Argonne offensives, winning a citation. He has been president of the Navy League and organized the first Navy Day.
>
> Colonel Breckinridge was captain of the American Olympic Fencing team in 1928. During the recent Russo-Finnish war, he initiated the movement in this country to send unrestricted contributions to Finland for the purchase of arms. The views he here expresses are, of course, his own. Like all other authors in these pages, he speaks for himself, not necessarily for CURRENT HISTORY.

But the fate of Scandinavia has rudely awakened many millions of Americans. Yesterday, they could not be blamed for not seeing. Today, if they do not see, they have joined the blind who *will* not see. As for politicians who counted for political preferment upon the deep sentiment of isolationism pervading the northern portion of the Mississippi Valley—how will they meet today the sharp change of mind of the millions of those good Americans of Scandinavian blood who wield such political power in that region?

Whether or not they paid their debts, whether or not they made every possible mistake during the last twenty years, the fundamental fact of the present world crisis is that, if Britain and France go down to destruction, the United States will stand alone face-to-face with the conquering dictator, both East and West. Then, verily, America, if it is to survive, must become the modern two-faced Janus that never sleeps. Under this appalling possibility, Hitler would seize Iceland and Greenland and be at our very gates with his vast air armada. To the west, a short hop across Bering Strait, is Stalin, the bird of prey ever poised for descent.

IF the slow moving body of American public opinion must wait that long, surely the presence of a single Nazi soldier or sailor in Iceland or Greenland will be the signal for war, unless the Munich umbrella is to be the immutable symbol of the dying democracies of the world.

Let us look a little more closely at these stepping stones between Europe and America. Europe to Iceland—520 to 685 miles, depending on the route used—an average two and one-half hour flight. Iceland to Greenland—190 to 475 miles. Greenland to

The above map shows the proximity of the United States and Canada to Iceland and Greenland, whose national sovereignties have been threatened by Germany through the annexation of Denmark. Also graphically illustrated is the fact that Alaska and Russia are practically touching at the nearest points.

the American continent 210 to 725 miles. (In the extreme north, Greenland nearly touches Arctic possessions of Canada.) These flights are child's play for the modern bomber and for accompanying fighting planes if refueling stations are established on the stepping stones.

War is the maddest folly of the human race. In the hands of man, today, is the medical knowledge to wipe out many of the maladies that scourge the race. The productive capacity of man-made machines could comfortably fulfill the material wants of the earth's entire population. The fields could yield through scientific agriculture enough to feed every hungry inhabitant. But we are confronted with a condition and not a theory. A series of Al Capones have seized dominion over millions of the world's inhabitants. They make a mock of honor. Their plighted word is only a snare to trap the fearful or the naive. The destruction of every weaker neighbor in succession is the pattern of the march to total empire. They plan and organize down to the last detail for the next lightning stroke of destruction. Before them, the democracies have vacillated, temporized, yielded until the first of last September when the die was cast for the life and death struggle that now rages. Let it not be forgotten that Hitler and Stalin already are in partnership and this partnership contains the fast flowering seed of the destruction of all free civilization.

It is fifty-five miles across the Bering Strait from the mainland of Alaska to Russia. The United States owns the Little Diomede Island in the Bering Strait. It is thirty miles from the mainland of Russia. Russia owns the Big Diomede Island which is at most five miles from the Little Diomede Island.

If the United States permits the dictators to come one more inch nearer our shores, it will be proof of a blindness and impotence that will merit and receive the contempt of history.

The United States should consult with the Allies for the purpose of interdicting Iceland and Greenland to the Nazis during the present war. On the appearance of the slightest probability of Nazi possession of these stepping stones to our mainland, the United States should intervene with force to prevent it.

Hitler Invades Scandinavia!

Sweden, jeopardized by Blitzkrieg in the North, hopes to stay neutral, but prepares for the worst

HUGH M. COLE
Instructor in History, University of Chicago

THE German invasion of Scandinavia took place only a few days after the British General Ironside told the press that in the German High Command there was no officer who had held more than the rank of captain in the World War. From this the Allied and neutral public might have reasoned that the German army was less ably led than in 1914 or 1918. If the German General Staff had determined upon it as a direct rebuttal of Ironside's insinuations, the *Blitzkrieg* in Scandinavia could have offered no more striking evidence that the German Army still has leaders as competent as the elder von Moltke or Ludendorff.

Whatever its outcome, the Scandinavian invasion must be regarded as one of the best handled military operations in the history of amphibian warfare. However, it is not entirely to be explained in terms of the training, armament and leadership of the invading armies. The occupation of Denmark, the establishment of an expeditionary force in Norway's strategic areas, the constantly increasing threat to Sweden—these facts must be considered in the light of the complex circumstances existing in Scandinavia when the war reached northward. How had the Scandinavian states hoped to retain their historic position as neutrals? What proved this hope to be illusory? What conditions in Denmark, Norway and Sweden determine their ability to resist armed aggression?

In 1939 the Scandinavian peoples awaited those consequences which the World War had taught neutrals to expect with a belief, also based on the World War, that the North could remain outside the new maelstrom. But the very first weeks brought the Scandinavian neutrals closer to the conflict than at any time during 1914-1918. Denmark mined its waterways leading into the Baltic, under threats from Berlin. British air attacks upon the German naval base at Sylt brought the detonation of bombs close to Danish ears. Norway prepared to act as the middleman in the North Sea, as in 1914, but in a few weeks was being subjected to violations of her neutrality by both Germany and England—violations more severe than she suffered during the entire World War. Submarine warfare, aided by aerial attack and floating mines, sank nearly 120,000 tons of Norse shipping and cost scores of lives before Germany climaxed such measures by "protective action" in the ports and harbors of Norway itself. Finally, the old fear of Russian aggression was revived with renewed vigor when Finland was weakened by the loss of its Karelian defenses.

As in the case of the other Scandinavian neutrals, the European war and the Finnish episode brought troubles and perils to Sweden. Her territory was twice bombed, by accident or intention, during the Russo-Finnish War; by March 16, 1940, her ship losses had reached 69,604 gross tons, while only 198,887 tons were destroyed in four years of the World War. One of the belligerents, Germany, mined the Sound just outside the three mile limit, violating for the first time in one hundred and sixty years the Swedish four mile zone.

Consistently, however, the northern neutrals held to the hope that they might be allowed to retain their neutrality even while military activity increased all about them and diplomatic pressure was exerted to force them into one camp or the other. Common sense dictated the middle course of neutrality, as did history, and it should be noticed that in spite of Churchill's sermons and Ribbentrop's threats, there was no clear case where all Scandinavian interests were identified with those of either of the belligerents.

Denmark, prior to the German invasion, presented an apt but sorry picture of the difficulties in Scandinavian neutrality. Economically, her interests were coincident with those of England; her farmers fed English factory hands and her livestock fattened on produce brought into Denmark across sea lanes controlled by the English fleet. On the eve of World War II the Danes received 34.5 per cent of their imports from Britain and only 24.5 per cent from Germany. More important, however, was the consideration which every Danish dairyman had to keep in mind—that Britain took 55.5 per cent of Denmark's exports while Germany was a customer for only 19.7 per cent. Even after war had begun and German mine fields endangered the route to England, *The London Times* estimated that Danish trade with Britain was still in a ratio of two to one as compared with the trade between Denmark and Germany.

The whole economic fabric of Danish society was matched to that of England, but geographical considerations compelled Denmark to adopt a supine attitude toward any strong military power on her land frontier. The submarine and mine made the North Sea coast of Denmark virtually inaccessible to any aid from England. The Baltic littoral lay under the guns of the

German fleet. The military might of the German neighbor must, in the long run, carry greater weight than the economic supremacy of England. This was one case where the customer could not possibly be right.

There was, however, always the hope that Denmark would be more useful to Germany in time of war as a port of entry than as a conquered colony. But there was also another way in which Denmark could be used to beat the blockade. German strategists had suggested that the blockade could be nullified by an immediate seizure of the food producing regions in Poland and Denmark.

Before the outbreak of the present war, Norway was less completely in the economic orbit of England than was Denmark. She sold 27.1 per cent of her exports to Britain and 15.7 per cent to Germany; from Britain came 23.2 per cent of her imports as compared with 17.2 per cent from Germany. A carrier of Europe's sea borne commerce, with 4,835,000 tons of shipping listed in Lloyd's Register, Norway desired to play no favorites and was, in fact, a rival of England in the world's sea lanes. As Poland, Russia and Finland all ceased to supply Britain with lumber, Norwegian timber, carried in Norwegian ships, became an essential item in England's preparations for defense. England could not afford to use ships essential for transporting food supplies in the long haul from the lumber docks of Canada.

To Germany, on the other hand, Norwegian territorial waters offered a corridor through the blockade, a corridor particularly important for the Swedish iron so vital in the production of German armaments and munitions. Although caught between two millstones, the Norse could still hope that they might not be ground to powder. And there was still a third danger to be remembered in Oslo—the revival of Russian imperialism. The 1939 pacts between Russia and Germany and the subsequent Russian invasion of Finland combined to make the Norse friendly to France and England. Yet, even so, Oslo tried to remain neutral in the purist sense. While Finland was fighting Russia, Foreign Minister of Norway, Halvdan Koht, affirmed publicly that "it is an historical fact that Russia has never made any demands whatsoever on Norway." Geography had placed Oslo far from Moscow, and so long as Finland and Sweden both held to the east, Norway could hardly be expected to see an enemy in the Red Army of 1940.

Sweden, most important of the northern states, had been close to Germany before the rise of Hitler. As Tsarist Russia displaced Sweden in the eastern Baltic and threatened Swedish domination in the Gulf of Bothnia, the cultural ties which had bound the German and Swedish peoples were strengthened by the belief

King Gustav

in Stockholm that German military might would never countenance Russian aggression against Sweden. Economically, too, Sweden was close to Germany. In 1938 she received 21.7 per cent of her imports from Germany, while even the United States topped Britain in sales to Sweden. However, Sweden sold 23.6 per cent of her exported goods to Britain as compared with the 18.1 per cent sold to Germany.

War made Sweden more and more dependent on trade connections with Germany since the terrific Scandinavian losses sustained in shipping to England were increased, in the case of Sweden, by German domination in the Sound. At the end of 1939 the Swedish export trade in timber had been halved as compared with that of August in the same year.

The German press had a ready solution for this threat to the economic life of Sweden. While German bombers sank Swedish vessels en route to England, the *Berliner Nachtausgabe* editorialized that "the best way to avoid peril is to avoid the open sea." And *Der Deutsche Volkswirt* assured the Swedish people that their economic future lay "not over the North Sea but over the broad and fertile expanse of Mittel-Europa." Germany, the middleman, would import Grecian olive oil for preserving Swedish sardines—and then provide a consumer for the prepared product!

At the outbreak of war in 1939 Sweden was also forced to recognize that Germany had no intention of sharing Swedish iron ore with the Allies, as in 1918. In 1937 and 1938 Germany had taken more than three-quarters of the iron exported from Swedish mines and, when war began, she warned Stockholm against any reduction in this amount. Yet the very existence of her rich ore deposits made Sweden hopeful of being able to avoid taking a belligerent's role in the European conflict. Two-thirds of her iron ore was located in the far north and was extremely difficult of access, while her mines in the south produced a grade of ore often too poor in quality for military use. In other words, even the most successful *Blitzkrieg* in south and central Sweden could not immediately bring more iron ore into German hands.

Since Sweden occupied a position of recognized leadership in the Scandinavian entente, Stockholm, more than Oslo or Copenhagen, felt the impact of those ideologies in Hitler's Reich which most threatened the democratic institutions of the North. Sweden, Norway, and Denmark all had looked askance at Allied imperialism and economic pressure in the post-world war era. But the kind of propaganda coming from Hitler's agents was hardly calculated to gain friends among the peoples of the North. The chief military and political journals in Germany levelled attacks against the "Marxists" of Sweden all through 1939. The Finnish war added fuel to the flames. Berlin carried on a systematic press attack against the Scandinavian states, declaring they had never shown the proper attitude toward the new German Reich, and that their animosity could be seen in their encouragement to the Finnish "war-mongers."

We may have to wait until the German archives are opened before we learn the exact manner in which war came to Scandinavia. But one determining factor will be found in the weakness of Denmark and Norway. There could be no hope of resistance to German attack by the

Danes—the Prussian invasion of 1864 had demonstrated that fact. The hard headed Danes had taken so realistic a view of their situation that in the nineteen-twenties numerous projects were advanced for disarming the land forces of the kingdom, leaving only a few regiments with side arms for police duties. The big German air maneuvers of last August were held close enough to the Danish border to dramatize Danish impotency, and when Denmark alone of the Scandinavian states accepted Hitler's "guarantees," the general opinion of the rest of Scandinavia was forcefully expressed by the *Svenska Dagbladet*, which called Denmark a "border state" not really belonging to the North.

A careful reading of Premier Stauning's speech last New Year's Day will show that he ruled out the possibility of self defense. And the resolution of the Danish *Folketing*, a few days later, "to use every available means .... to protect the peace and independence of the country," was mere window dressing to show that Denmark, in so far as possible, would maintain her international obligations as an independent state.

When Denmark became the object of aggression, the other Scandinavian states could give no real aid. With this in mind Swedish military leaders had always overruled suggestions for a Scandinavian military alliance.

Norway, on the other hand, held a favorable geographic position in the north, but had counted on nature to such a degree that she had built no real navy to defend her merchant fleet, the fourth largest in the world, and possessed an army inferior in size and equipment to that of Denmark. Before the European war reached northward, neutral observers believed that the immediate Norwegian contribution to Scandinavian defense could only be a force of a hundred thousand or so, most of whom had never received more than two months' training, with perhaps another hundred and fifty thousand semi-trained men as the last reserves. Practically all the arms and munitions would have to be furnished by Sweden.

Too long a reliance on the Swedish buffer, on the inaccessible and treacherous western coastline and on the League of Nations, coupled with a pacifist civil government, had resulted in a puny program of Norwegian coast defense. The fortresses of Lofoden and Trondheim Fjord were antiquated. Kirkenes, heart of any defense against a Russian attack from the north, for years had been little more than a frontier outpost. Even after a professional soldier, Colonel Ljundberg, was appointed minister of defense in 1939, little attention was given to the coastal defenses in the west and south, as the ease with which German forces took possession of the chief fortress cities graphically demonstrated.

It is only 15 miles from German-held Copenhagen to the Swedish mainland and only slightly more than 150 miles from Stockholm to the new Russian bases off Finland. To the north, on the Gulf of Bothnia, is the iron ore port of Lulea, ice free in summer.

Norse weakness should not be blamed entirely on the pacifist politicians who had hamstrung military preparedness. Some of the Norwegian army chieftains had failed to cooperate with Socialist party governments. Major Vidkun Quisling, who constituted a provisional government at Oslo on behalf of the Nazi invaders, represented a treacherous element in the Norwegian army. He had once been a member of the General Staff, was minister of defense in 1931-33. To what extent he had connections with Nazi sympathizers in the Norse officer corps is as yet hard to say.

Two remaining factors aid in explaining the ease with which German troops were landed on Norwegian soil: first, the belief held for years in Norse military and naval circles that the English navy could be counted upon as a first line of defense for Norway in any war with Germany; second, the defensive doctrines of Norse strategists who laid primary stress upon partisan and guerilla warfare in accordance with the character of the Norwegian terrain.

Sweden presented a far different picture, when the European war broke out, than either of her two Scandinavian neighbors. When Germany offered "guarantees" to the Northern Bloc with such strings attached as to constitute an infringement of national sovereignty, Denmark accepted the guarantees, Nor-

(Continued on page 49)

A Plan for Europe's Cockpit

Proposal that the Balkans solve their problems internally by an exchange of minority groups

GABOR DE BESSENYEY

Distinguished Hungarian; formerly Professor of European Government at Fordham University

As the European drama unfolds, month by month increasing attention is devoted to four nations in the Southeast: Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Bulgaria. In this part of the world, it is claimed, an important decision will be reached. Either there will arise a new front attacking the southeastern flank of Germany where the Siegfried Line does not extend, or the rich land of the Magyars, Rumanians, and South-Slavs will supply Germany with the food, timber, ore, livestock and oil which she needs to fight the war.

That is why the Carpathian Basin, the lower Danube and the Balkan Mountains remain the objects of strategic, economic, and political surveys by Germans, Italians, Russians, neutrals, and Allies. This phenomenal interest, however, seems to involve little solicitude for the wellbeing of the sixty million people inhabiting that area. It may be appropriate, therefore, to examine the situation from the point of view of these peoples themselves.

Why has this part of Europe been the breeding ground of war? Why are the nations of this area just so many pawns in the game of power-politics? No better reason can be given than that the political boundaries in this area do not coincide with the ethnic boundaries. This causes animosities which are based on the existence of mixed populations living as minority groups under foreign flags. Such minorities exist in Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Slovakia, but they do not present problems as acute as the minority groups in Rumania. Out of Rumania's twenty million people, approximately five million can be classed as minorities. There are two million Hungarians, nearly as many Russians, and a large block of Bulgarians, as well as others. (The statistics we use are necessarily arbitrary; census-takings are few and far between, and existing figures diverge irreconcilably.)

Of all these minority groups in Rumania the issue presented by the Bulgarians would lend itself to the easiest solution, both because the territory in which they live, flanked by the Black Sea and the Danube, is a continuous topographical and economic unit with Bulgaria, and because their number is but 1 per cent of Rumania's population, which would be a loss of no consequence to the latter nation.

The Bessarabian minority in northeastern Rumania, ten times as large as the Bulgarian, raises a somewhat different issue. First, the bargaining power between Russia and Rumania is so far from equal that the return of this minority depends merely upon Russia's whim. Foreign Commissar Molotov only recently declared that Russia has never recognized Rumania's claim to Bessarabia. Should the Soviet war machine be put into action on this front, Rumania's defense could be no more than a gesture. In fact, the main defense lines of eastern Rumania run behind, and not in front of, this territory. Moreover, the issue as regards Bessarabia is further confused by the collision of economic systems. The Bessarabian peasant faces a difficult choice: he can again become a Russian, or he can keep his cow!

The central issue narrows down, then, to the two million Hungarians within the borders of Rumania who were transferred to that country by the Treaty of Trianon with complete disregard for their rights of national self-determination guaranteed by President Wilson's Fourteen Points.

At this point, the American reader may ask: "Why don't all these people bury the hatchet and get along in peace? Look at New York City, where Armenians, Poles, Irishmen, Jews, Russians, Germans, and many others live side by side. Why cannot the people of Central and Southeastern Europe do the same?" Such a comparison is misleading. The various races and nationalities of Europe have no central allegiance binding them together. The Hungarians and Bulgarians in Rumania, for instance, did not voluntarily pledge allegiance to a foreign government, as did immigrants coming to America. A more accurate comparison would be the situation that would arise if California were placed under the rule of the Japanese.

In Southeastern Europe the minorities proved tragic from the standpoint of the country which lost them, from the standpoint of the minorities themselves, and, finally, from the standpoint of the country which gained them.

A nation which loses a section of its people is humiliated and weakened. The economic order is upset; cities lose their hinterlands; communication systems are disrupted; and the state is inundated by homeless refugees.

The minority itself sinks to the degree of second class citizens, who at best are merely tolerated. Whenever a crisis threatens in Southeastern Europe, it is invariably some of their numbers who are flogged, incarcerated, and led to the gallows; or pardoned, freed, and decorated, depend-

ing upon the direction of the political wind. Whenever a major settlement is in the offing, it is that status quo affecting them which is revoked, suspended, or guaranteed.

From the standpoint of the state which contains the minority, the situation is also undesirable. Take the case of the minority soldier. If he serves in the army, a loyal soldier must be available to keep watch on him. Defense lines, too, must be made doubly strong if the population nearby is not in sympathy with the state. Small Rumania maintains an army larger than that of the United States. Is this meant as protection against aggression by Russia or Germany? If so, its existence cannot be justified, for even if every man, woman and child in the country were mustered into it, it would be too weak to withstand either nation. Its only reason for being is to maintain within Rumanian boundaries a few million people who would prefer to leave. Considering the expense of feeding, clothing, and quartering that army, the minorities are an expensive luxury.

Past attempts to settle the problems concerning different nationalities under one sovereignty were in the direction of minority legislation. When the Treaty of Trianon was concluded, Rumania and Hungary signed an agreement by which the former promised to respect the Hungarian minority's cultural, religious, and linguistic rights. Yet the past twenty years have seen ill-feeling between these two countries intensify as a direct result of the minority problem. Why is minority legislation usually, if not always, completely unsuccessful?

One difficulty is that of determining exactly what a minority is. Mere questioning of the doubtful individual involved means little; some answers are pointed in the direction of the political wind or influenced by the most recent propaganda. Furthermore, the census-taker has been known to convert nationality into whatever he wants it to be.

Then there is the 20 per cent rule; no minority is entitled to "rights" unless its members number at least 20 per cent of the inhabitants of the community or district in which they live. In towns near the 20 per cent border line, it is always easy to tip the scale by using the state's power of recruiting soldiers, transferring officials and so forth.

The Bulgarian minority in Rumania lives south of Constanza between the Danube and the Black Sea. To return it to Bulgaria would involve the cession of little territory. North and east of the River Pruth lies Bessarabia, once Russian. It is not defended, as the main Rumanian fortifications are west of the river.

A third hurdle is the margin between the spirit and the letter of the law. Assuming that a minority is granted a school and a teacher who will teach their language, can it be expected that the ruling nationality will hire a teacher who will denounce the government which employs him? And, on the other hand, can it be expected that the minority will respect one whom they consider a renegade.

Fourth, but far from last, is the consideration of the social weight of various individuals. In any community there are always persons who, through no special merit of their own, have enjoyed greater cultural and economic advantages than others; and there are also some who, through no fault of their own, lack those advantages. The former invariably are of greater social weight than the latter. The issue is not whether they should be, should have been, or should remain so; the point is merely that they are, and that history's hand, in its diagonal progress, caressed one before the other. The result is that, by applying at any given time the same treatment to all, we unjustly penalize some who are accustomed to manage and give dangerous weapons into the inexperienced hands of others.

These are but some of the many reasons why minority legislation has not worked and cannot work. It is predicated on the hopeless premise that, after the enactment of the law, human nature will change. But, as twenty years of minority legislation have proved, human nature does not change. Men continue to be greedy, selfish, and ready to take advantage of their opponents' temporary weakness. Besides, all minority legislation is like an accordion: the rights involved can be contracted to so small a minimum that they include little more than mere living and breath-

ing, or they can be expanded to the point of complete autonomy, which inevitably leads to secession.

Lord Runciman, having investigated the German demand for complete autonomy in the Sudeten area of Czecho-Slovakia, suggested immediate and complete cession of that territory to Germany, believing that autonomy would merely postpone an inevitable result. Through the centuries we hear the echo of Machiavelli's cynicism in regard to minorities:

"Either give them complete liberty or exterminate them; no half measures will suffice."

What cure can then be offered for this illness affecting Southeastern Europe? Blood transfusions having failed, a surgical operation is in order.

The approximately 50,000 square miles of Hungarian territory given to Rumania in the last peace treaty are divided into four subdivisions. Transylvania accounts for about 30,000 square miles, while the Rumanian Banat, Krishina, and Maramuresh make up the other 20,000. The two million Hungarians in Rumania live partly adjoining their mother country and partly in one solid block in southern Transylvania, surrounded from all sides by Rumanians. These latter are known as the Szekely people, and it is sometimes claimed that they form a distinct minority. This supposition is erroneous; the Szekelys shared Hungary's destinies for a thousand years and speak the purest Hungarian.

The surgical operation proposed is the following:

First, the outright cession to Hungary of Maramuresh, Krishina, and the northern half of the Rumanian Banat. Secondly, the exchanging of the Szekely people in return for the Rumanians inhabiting these eighteen thousand square miles.

With no more minorities left, the confused maze of minority legislation could be relegated to the scrap heap.

Needless to say, a population exchange is bound to inflict hardship on some, but this sacrifice will prove well worth its cost in the long run. Greece and Turkey exchanged their respective minorities after the last war, and similar shifts are now taking place in Poland, proving the feasibility of population exchange.

The return of Maramuresh to Hungary is logical because the Ruthenian population there could be joined to

Collins, The Montreal Gazette

On the Lookout

the autonomous Ruthenian portion of Hungary. If, then, Slovakia should cede the Ruthenian county on her eastern border, all Ruthenians, about one million strong, could be combined into one administrative district. The metropolitan city of Kassa on Hungary's northernmost boundary would thereby regain her hinterland.

The Hungarian minority in Yugoslavia numbers approximately three hundred thousand, most of whom live in districts adjoining Hungary. A similar exchange of population, combined with a small cession of territory, would further improve the already excellent relations between Hungary and Yugoslavia, and relieve the latter country of a cumbersome minority problem which might endanger that friendly relationship at some future time.

Czecho-Slovakia's fate after ceding the Sudeten area to Germany naturally springs to mind. The situations, however, are dissimilar. King Carol of Rumania is asked to negotiate with a nation half the size of his own, whereas former President Benes was confronted with the demands of an overwhelming power. Furthermore the Sudeten territory was economically and geographically an integral part of Czecho-Slovakia, while the Hungarian lands now governed by Rumania are not topographically a unit with it.

In regard to Rumania's oil, which is vital to Germany's war machine, it might be noted that none of it lies in the areas we are considering. Moreover, we are dealing in permanent premises, such as the settlement of perennial disputes in Southeastern Europe by boundary adjustment and minority population exchange; these premises are quite independent of the current issues of the war.

These four nations: Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, fall into the natural economic sphere of Germany, and will continue to do so regardless of whether the destinies of that nation are directed by a Kaiser, Fuehrer, or President. Highly industrialized Germany is the logical market for Southeastern Europe's agricultural produce. The Danube, canalized and connected with the Elbe and the Rhine to spread the distribution of Balkan goods, is a trade artery of the utmost importance. Any interference with this natural flow is contrary to economic laws and must be paid for dearly. If, for instance, France and England ceased to use cereals, timber, and oil supplied by their own colonies and dominions, and bought these products, instead, from Southeastern Europe, they would have to pay higher prices, excessive transportation charges, and extensive subsidies to compensate their own producers for their lost market. Such a procedure could not be carried on very long.

It is said that a state of emergency exists. Granted. But when will it cease? Even when hostilities between the Allies and Germany come to an end, who can guarantee that Russia will not attempt to expand southward into the Balkans? If she does, the "emergency" goes on. Then again, Italy may come to grips with English influence on the Mediterranean: once more there would be an extraordinary condition. In each case the emergency will seem imperative. Yet the fact remains that, except in a few short intervals, the Balkan Peninsula has been under German economic

(Continued on page 61)

The Runaway Budget

National spending must be brought under control, declares this Republican candidate for President

THOMAS E. DEWEY

THE people of this country have the same respect for a balanced budget they have always had. They can and do understand government economics and government finance when the facts are clearly and honestly presented to them. In these circumstances, I wish to present here the proof that federal spending is quite beyond the control of the present Administration. It is running wild to the danger and hardship of every one of us.

National government cost has risen, approximately, from 3¾ billion dollars in the fiscal year 1933 to 9¼ billion in 1939. The national debt has mounted from 22½ billion dollars in 1933 to 40½ billion in 1939 and is now above the 42 billion dollar mark.

Those few facts alone should bring us up short before the reality of a grave situation. They represent a trend in national spending that can get us nowhere excepting into national bankruptcy and the misery of a far lower standard of living. Before going into these matters of highly personal concern, however, let us consider what has been done to the national budget by the present Administration during the past seven years.

A budget, as all homemakers or business people in this country know, is a forecast of probable income alongside probable expense. It is a guide in planning both immediate and future activities. The whole idea of a budget is to make outgo balance income. Otherwise why have a budget?

A forecast of income can usually be quite accurate. A forecast of outgo is usually the result of most careful planning. It assumes a determination to hold to the plans made. There are no different kinds of budgets. A home budget or a business man's budget is not fundamentally different from a national budget. But the national budget is a guide to every business man and a promise by his government. One of the great causes of our continuous state of depression is the breach of promise in every budget offered since 1933 and the utter incompetence or worse exhibited in its preparation.

Most of us, I know, shy away from tabulations, but below is one so compelling as to command our attention. It pictures government budgeting for five successive years, and accurately registers the total failure of financial planning by the present Administration.

The figures show the surplus or deficit officially forecast by the Administration each year, the actual deficit realized and the size of the errors.

There's the record. Nothing but errors shown.

Not once did the present Administration accurately measure the probable national income, its own expenditures or the relationship between income and outgo.

In two out of five years it promised a surplus that was never attained. For those two years, in fact, it saddled the people of the country with a combined deficit of just under 4½ billion dollars. During these five years alone, deficit forecasts totalled about 4 billion dollars and we actually had a deficit of 15 billion. The Administration as such doesn't have to worry about its gross error of 11¼ billion dollars for this period alone. That is passed down to us as part of our national debt. The error is criminal and unnecessary.

No matter how we look at the figures, we find only miscalculation and deficits. This year we are promised a deficit of 4 billion dollars.

National spending has for years been out of hand. It is still out of hand.

NEVER in the history of the world has there been spending more ungoverned or more startling. This Administration has already more than doubled the net total of national debt accumulated during all our history up to 1932. Before we can be released, it will have spent approximately 66 billion dollars, or almost the exact cost of our national government from the day of George Washington up to the close of the World War, a period of 131 years.

Responsible government officials have, of late, actually minimized the importance of the national debt. The purpose of their campaign is, apparently, to cover the gravity of the economic conditions they have brought us. At other times they have countered criticism of their spendthrift ways by asking the critic to tell how to balance the budget. This expedient, of course, implies that the national

BUDGET ERRORS
Surplus (+) *Deficit* (–)
(In millions of dollars)

	Forecast	*Realization*	*Error*
1935	+ 14	– 3,002	3,016
1936	– 3,893	– 4,361	468
1937	– 519	– 2,708	2,189
1938	+ 1,538	– 1,460	2,998
1939	– 950	– 3,543	2,593
	– 3,810	– 15,074	11,264

budget cannot be balanced. It really means only that this Administration cannot do the job. The spokesmen ask us to have faith in their ability to provide recovery, even though they admit failure and show their lack of sound business judgment.

Despite the defeatism and the bad example in Washington today, the national budget can be balanced. Sound budgeting is in line with sound recovery measures. Fortunately, we have good examples set us elsewhere in the country.

THOMAS E. DEWEY, candidate for the Republican nomination for President, has been running well ahead in the early primary returns. In the poll conducted by CURRENT HISTORY, announced in the April issue, Mr. Dewey was picked by 37.08 per cent of the editors of the daily newspapers in the United States as the man who will be nominated for President by the Republican party.

In this special article for CURRENT HISTORY, Mr. Dewey asserts that the national budget can be balanced, despite "defeatism" on the subject.

It may be unnecessary to remind our readers that CURRENT HISTORY does not take sides in politics. This article is presented for its interest and importance as representing the viewpoint of a man who is a candidate for the highest office in the land.

MANY states and municipalities across the country recently have demonstrated that benefits spring from practical, budget-balancing economy. It has been possible, even in such a comparatively small part of the whole economic set-up as the New York County District Attorney's office, to cut the cost of an essential service by 28 per cent, with an actual increase in efficiency. Business men everywhere, in spite of the obstacles thrown in their way by the national government, are still managing to conduct their enterprises on the sound-budget plan.

Knowing the folly of letting the budget run wild, they are more and more inclined to mark time until budget control is restored to the conduct of government business.

The New Dealers, year after year, talk of the necessity of balancing the budget, and yet in the same breath they attempt to justify profligate expenditure. Meanwhile, the people of the United States cannot afford to spend 8 to 10 billion dollars a year on national government—not under anything like present conditions.

Business alone cannot carry the total cost of all government, local, state and federal. In 1937, best of the lean New Deal years, the aggregate net profit of all corporations in this country was 7¾ billion dollars, while the cost of all government was 17 billion.

The rich pay up to 79 per cent of income toward national government. But they do not have the wherewithal for all of the load either. If the federal government in 1937 had commanded every individual to pay in every cent earned over $5,000, the total would *still* have been 3¾ billion dollars short of what the government spent that year. That's why all of us, as consumers, chip in to pay the cost of federal government.

Every one of us who buys goods at the village grocery, the corner drug store, the garage or elsewhere pays heavy dues for our present national government. You and I pay $20.39 federal taxes on a $700 automobile . . . $1.82 on a $20 shotgun . . . $7.15 on a $150 refrigerator . . . $3 on a $33 radio . . . 5 cents on a 50-cent box of face powder . . . one-half cent a pound on every pound of sugar . . . 2¼ cents a pound on every automobile tire . . . a cent on every gallon of gasoline . . . 4 cents per gallon on lubricating oil . . . 10 cents on every phone call costing more than 50 cents . . . one cent out of every ten from every movie admission over 40 cents . . . 6 cents on a 10 or 15 cent pack of cigarettes . . . and so on down the list.

These taxes and other levies on consumption hidden away in the prices of things we buy are no small item of expense. In 1933 they cost us just over a billion dollars. Today the same taxes cost us more than 2 billion dollars a year.

Mr. Roosevelt was right when, as a candidate in 1932, he said, "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and are paid through production." His Administration has served to increase taxation's sweat and to cut production without warrant.

By these policies, the Administration seems to have forgotten completely its real obligation to the needy, the unemployed and the new generation of workers coming along each year. For government can only meet its many obligations as long as agriculture, industry and all business function to capacity. New Deal policies have kept our economy from functioning properly and thus have been destroying the sources of income. If we permit them to continue doing so, we will find there's a bottom to the well.

If we do not check the present trend in government spending, there will soon be only two courses open to the spenders. They might bring themselves up short, cut expenditures and levy taxes so excessive as to destroy utterly the standards of business and living. Or, as an alternative, they might repudiate the national debt, bring about inflation and leave us all in the misery of national bankruptcy and chaos.

I BELIEVE the people of the United States are coming to realize our present situation. When they do, they can and will bring these policies to an end by the remedy of a change in Administration.

This matter of the budget is not academic. It is the concern of the man on relief or W.P.A. rolls, who out of his paltry income helps to pay the cost of government. It is the concern of the business man who sees even confidence marking time. The New Deal has the country spending its time in worry and fear instead of methodically solving its problems in a commonsense, businesslike way. This is reality. It is not yet too late to bring national spending under control. It is not too late once more to become the masters of our own destiny.

The Issues in 1940

Ohio's Republican candidate believes our economic system will collapse, unless we return to time-tested methods

SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

WHAT are the fundamental differences between the two parties as we approach the 1940 campaign?

In the rapidly changing kaleidoscope of European destruction, it is impossible to say now what the issues of foreign policy may be in November. It is impossible to say how far questions of foreign policy may affect or dominate the election. Today both parties insist that they are determined to keep us out of the European war. The President, in his Chicago quarantine speech, not in many later utterances, however, indicated before the war began that he favored a participation in European affairs so long as it did not involve the sending of troops. Since the war began, he has not reiterated this view, but the suspicion remains that if he or those sympathizing with him are elected to office, they will not be so strenuous in favor of American neutrality. The Republican leaders agree that this country should not meddle in European affairs. The Republican party is more likely to insure peace to this country than the Democratic party.

SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT is a son of the 27th President of the United States. In the recent poll conducted by CURRENT HISTORY, Senator Taft won 25.42 per cent of the votes cast by the daily newspaper editors of the United States in response to the question: Who do you think will be nominated for President by the Republican Party? Most political observers seem to agree that the race for that nomination has narrowed to one between Senator Taft and Mr. Dewey.

In this special article for CURRENT HISTORY on the issues of 1940, Senator Taft maintains that the Republican Party is more likely to insure peace to this country than the Democratic Party.

In the domestic field, there is a multitude of issues, but there are two which seem to me fundamental. Our economic system is far from perfect. How shall it be improved? How shall abuses be eliminated? The Republican party believes in dealing with each abuse as it arises, without any substantial change in the business system, or in the character of the federal government, or in the division of power between the federal government on one hand and the state and local governments on the other. It believes that a solution can be worked out by the education of public opinion; by the co-operation of industry and labor; by the co-ordinated action of states and local governments. The process may be slower. It may take a long time to reach every section of the nation, but when done it is more permanently done and more firmly based on public opinion.

The New Deal on the other hand believes in meeting every problem by federal legislation, conferring arbitrary power on federal bureaus. A typical example is the investment trust bill now pending in the Senate. Because abuses occurred in this new industry, the federal government is to assume complete charge of the entire industry, even that which is purely intra-state. No effort has been made to encourage state legislation. No effort has been made to develop from the industry itself remedies which the industry is glad to have applied by the government. After four years of study, costing about a million dollars, the S.E.C. produces a bill giving exclusive federal jurisdiction, riding over state laws, and putting in the hands of the S.E.C. arbitrary power to regulate nearly every detail of the entire business.

The federal government assumes to tell every farmer how he shall run his farm, every business man how he shall run his business. Millions of reports pour into Washington every year to lie covered with dust in government storehouses. The National Labor Relations Board is not concerned with insuring to workmen who wish it the right to bargain collectively, but sets out to organize every factory in the United States, whether the men wish it or not. There is a yearning desire to extend federal aid to education, with the inevitable control in Washington bureaus. There is a yearning desire to extend federal control over medicine. We have a bill before us now providing for a federally-owned system of general hospitals. The New Dealers do not hesitate to bypass the states, and there is little doubt that they would prefer to see the states mere provinces, subject to Congressional regulation. They wish Congress to delegate all legislative power to executive bureaus. They have attacked the courts, and successfully deprived them of much independence.

The type of government which they propose is fundamentally different from that which America has heretofore known. It slants towards the totalitarian state as we see it in Germany and Italy. It is a government of men and not of law. It will gradually

(Continued on page 56)

"Cord" Hull: Tennessee Statesman

Born and brought up in a Lincolnesque environment, this border American has become presidential timber

FRED HIXSON

Six and one-half years after an assassin's bullet ended the career of one of the greatest statesmen the South ever produced —the immortal Abraham Lincoln— another great American — Cordell Hull—was born in the Tennessee mountains in an environment as humble as the early Lincoln's.

Today Cordell Hull occupies the office of Secretary of State and many of his fellow countrymen acclaim him as the logical man to succeed Franklin D. Roosevelt as President of the United States. Mr. Hull is Tennessee's first statesman since James K. Polk to hold a widely recognized claim to the presidency, though Andrew Johnson was catapulted into that high office by John Wilkes Booth's mad act in Ford's Theater on the night of April 14, 1865. Hull has been regarded as presidential timber for the past twelve years.

In many respects the careers of Lincoln and Hull have been similar. Both are products of the Southern frontier. In the little village of Olympus, Tennessee, Hull was born October 2, 1871, the son of a mountain farmer. It is scarcely a hundred miles as the crow flies from Olympus to the small frontier settlement of Hodgenville, Kentucky, where Lincoln was born February 12, 1809, the son of a carpenter.

The backgrounds of these two American statesmen were much the same. Both had ancestors of the Anglo-Saxon strain. Both started out to be lawyers, but found themselves better fitted by temperament and training for political careers. Both as young men displayed wisdom in public affairs. Both were assisted in their public service by unswerving devotion to democratic principles— a devotion so earnest that they soon found men rallying behind their standards. Legislative halls lured both from the law and claimed their services as young men. In war, both raised volunteer companies and became army captains—Lincoln in the Black Hawk Indian War and Hull in the Spanish-American. But neither distinguished himself as a warrior; both reached the scene after the fighting had ended. Finally, both went to Congress. Shall we soon be able to add, "And both became President"?

Lincoln was a tall, lean, lanky man, six feet four. Hull is of somewhat similar physique. In Congress both established reputations as understanding, sympathetic and infinitely patient men—men of adamant principle. And Hull, as Lincoln was, is a man of solemn mien.

Although Cordell Hull has rounded out nearly a half century in the service of government, he has never shown signs of tiring under the heavy load and the long years. Today he is as alert mentally as he was in 1893 when, as a twenty-two year old mountain lawyer, he went to Nashville to take his seat in the Tennessee General Assembly. Since then, he has sat in the seats of the mighty and rubbed elbows with the world's greatest men, but to the simple, devoted Americans in the mountains of Tennessee where he was born he is still "Cord" Hull.

While the roar of the cannon which had raged in the border state of Tennessee throughout the War Between the States had died away when Hull was born, the aftermath of that bloody struggle—reconstruction, it was miscalled so far as the South was concerned—was raging in its fullest fury. As a young man, Hull frequently found his elder acquaintances at the county store and the school house whittling and "cussin'" the "damyankees" for the way they treated the South after Lincoln's assassination. With that background, he easily allied himself with the Democratic party even before he came of voting age.

In the common schools of Pickett County, where he received his early education, fellow students regarded the lanky mountain boy as a scholar. In his early teens Hull became interested in public questions. The community school house was the center for forums on public affairs—it was where the politicians gathered to deliver their campaign oratory. And in those days in Tennessee young men frequently turned to "politicking" before they were old enough to vote. Hull was no exception. He was a constant attendant at public meetings in the school house, driving to them in a wagon or on mule back. Not long ago, he recalled these occasions and expressed hope that similar meetings could be revived in every community of the United States.

In such meetings, Mr. Hull holds, the germ of democracy was implanted in the youth of yesteryear. They not only afforded the backwoodsmen means of satisfying their gregarious instincts, but also brought them information they needed about the affairs of their government. Hull believes in frank and unrestrained discussion of all government problems.

Fred Hixson has been political writer and expert for *The Chattanooga Times* for the past ten years. As such, he has carefully studied Secretary Cordell Hull's progress. Mr. Hixson was born in a Tennessee village, and many of his ancestors lived in the section of the State where Secretary Hull was born. Hixson was educated in the public schools of Hamilton County, Tennessee, at the University of Chattanooga and in the Law College of the University of Virginia. He was a member of the Tennessee delegation to the National Democratic convention in 1932. Mr. Hull also was a member of that delegation. Mr. Hixson was admitted to the Tennessee bar in 1932. He has covered all important political events in the south for the past decade.

And it was in such a laboratory that in his adolescence he found full expression for his innate passion for democracy.

As a lad of sixteen, Hull finished a hard day of plowing late one afternoon, tramped through the mountains several miles to a political meeting, and there delivered his first political speech. Benton McMillin was a candidate for re-election to Congress. Professor Joe McMillin had taught "Cord" at the Montvale Academy and Hull went to express his opinion of his teacher's brother, the Congressman. This experience started Hull on his political career. A year or so later he hitched his father's horse to the family buggy and with $30 he had saved drove the Governor of Tennessee on a campaign trip through the mountains.

"Cord's" devotion to serious subjects pleased his father, who had literally fought for existence as a pioneer in the Cumberland mountains. Billy Hull, the Secretary of State's father, was a shrewd trader. As a young man, he managed to save a thousand dollars and purchased a tract of timber land along the Wolf River. There Cordell, as a young man, felled trees and rafted logs down the Wolf to the Cumberland and on to Nashville. Billy Hull soon became a wealthy man who commanded much influence along the Kentucky border. When "Cord" showed an aptitude for study he was sent down to Montvale Academy in nearby Celina. It was there he met Professor Joe and Benton McMillin. The latter became Governor and finally lived to see "Cord" Secretary of State.

When Hull completed his work at the Montvale Academy, he was sent, first, to the National Normal School at Lebanon, Indiana, and then to Cumberland University Law School in Tennessee. Admitted to the Tennessee bar, he opened an office in Celina a few months before his twentieth birthday. There his father had acquired a rich river bottom farm.

At the age of twenty-one, Cordell was elected to the General Assembly as representative of a tier of mountain counties along the Tennessee border. In a few years, he had become a leader in the legislature and had made valuable friendships—among them one with another Tennessean who figured conspicuously in the Roosevelt Administration—the late House Speaker Joseph W. Byrns.

F. P. G.

Captain Cordell Hull of Company H, Fourth Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, during the Spanish-American War. Hull, who was then 26, recruited his own company from the Upper Cumberland mountain counties.

The year 1898 provided the next milestone in the Secretary of State's career, when the United States went to war with Spain. Hull went through his native section and raised a company of volunteers, but arrived in Cuba too late. Practically the only distinction the young captain salvaged from his military career was the reputation for being the best poker player in the American expeditionary force. In fact, his reputation as a poker player once threatened to do him harm. Shortly after James B. Frazier became Governor of Tennessee in 1903, a vacancy in the judgeship of the Fifth Tennessee Circuit occurred. Hull's rivals, seeking to keep him off the bench, pictured him as a "wild-eyed young poker-playing lawyer." Hull, called into conference by Frazier, readily admitted the poker-playing, but promised to give it up so long as he was on the bench. Whereupon, Frazier handed him the commission.

Since early manhood, Hull had enjoyed the reputation of being a man who never forgot a friend. After President Roosevelt invited him to become Secretary of State, Hull, his intimates report, made one request—that the President would nominate Governor Frazier's son, James B. Frazier, Jr., as United States District Attorney for eastern Tennessee. The request was granted.

Interesting stories have floated over Tennessee about Hull's work on the bench. A certain influential man in the upper mountain counties had been in the habit of getting drunk, running amuck and defying anyone to do anything about it. Brought into Judge Hull's court, he was fined and sentenced to thirty days in jail. "I've got that fine right here in my jeans," said the prisoner contemptuously.

"Yes," said Hull, "but you haven't got the thirty days."

In 1906, Hull decided to run for Congress, and, winning election, devoted his early years in Washington to study the tariff and taxation problems. In his congressional campaigns he became a champion of low tariffs, following the traditional doctrine of the Democratic party.

When President Wilson's leaders started marshalling their forces in Congress to write his campaign promises into law, they found that Hull could be relied upon as an authority. Accordingly, he was assigned the task of writing the first income tax law. Hull's theory was that an income tax, properly imposed, would replace such revenues as would be lost in lowering tariff barriers. This, he held, would shift the heaviest burden of taxation to the rich from the shoulders of those less able to bear it. He preached the doctrine that an excessive tariff—one imposed beyond the needs of protection—amounted in effect to a tax on the consumer.

In 1916, Hull also wrote the law embodying the national inheritance tax. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue frequently called him into consultation on tax problems.

When the United States entered the World War, the problem of raising huge sums of money faced the Administration and President Wilson welcomed Hull's advice in framing the revenue laws of that period. It was Hull who first advocated placing a surtax on Liberty bonds beyond a a limited holding. This, he argued, would prevent the bonds from finding their way back into the hands of the wealthy few after the end of the war.

Before long, Hull had become the most persistent member of Congress on tariff issues. He constantly fought against high tariff levies. But in the days of Coolidge "prosperity" and the Hoover debacle, Hull's counsel went unheeded while the Grundys, the Smoots, the Hawleys, the Fordneys and the McCumbers forced their will on Congress and, according to Hull's

version, tripped the nation's economic balance and brought on the depression. Tariff barriers, he contended, did more to destroy the nation's economic equilibrium than any other one factor. They destroyed the markets for surplus commodities, stagnated business in all categories and finally reduced national income to a new low. Hence the purchasing power of the masses dropped alarmingly.

One of Hull's last speeches before he entered the Roosevelt Cabinet was made in Chattanooga in 1932 on behalf of the Roosevelt-Garner ticket. The major theme of his speech was the same old subject, the tariff problem.

Hull's meek appearance, his kindly manners and gentlemanly bearing are frequently deceptive. They do not hint that behind them is great courage. He has never shirked what he has construed as his duty in a fight. He rubbed elbows and broke bread with timber hands in his early days and he learned what it took to stay at the job. Later, more than one statesman provoked his ire only to learn that this lamb could become a lion. He has a shy and delightful satire and wit he excludes from public discourse, but not from his intimate friends.

Hull was a member of the national House of Representatives uninterruptedly from 1907 to 1921. He had been a very active member in the World War Congress. It was his district, incidentally, which produced Sergeant Alvin York, whom General John J. Pershing described as the most outstanding individual soldier of the World War. Wayne Clouse, a mountain Justice of the Peace and a Republican, became a candidate against Hull in 1920 and defeated him. But the Democratic party pressed him into service as Chairman of the Democratic National Executive Committee when former Governor White, of Ohio, resigned after the ill-fated Cox-Roosevelt presidential campaign in 1920. Hull remained out of Congress only two years. In 1922 he was easily reelected.

He is a sincere prohibitionist. He was ever cautious to prevent his political races from becoming involved in local controversies. When he came to a town to campaign, he always called on the leaders without the company of his local manager. Apparently, he feared that one of his

Harris and Ewing

Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Postmaster James A. Farley talk things over.

friends might hold the enmity of other friends.

In 1930, after he had spent twenty-one years in the House, Hull asked the people of Tennessee to promote him to the Senate. They did. He had not been in the Senate long, before one day, a "Mr. Farley" of New York was there to see him. (Question: Will Mr. Hull run for President this year on a Hull-Farley ticket?) It is no secret that Farley thinks more of Hull than he does of any other member of the Roosevelt Cabinet.

Hull's first choice for Democratic standard bearer in 1932 was the late Newton D. Baker. But soon he became convinced that the logical man was Governor Roosevelt. Once in the Roosevelt camp, Hull did valuable work and his counsel was freely sought and as freely given.

The election over, Roosevelt set about to make up his Cabinet. Influential advisors demanded that Hull be in the Cabinet, as Secretary of State or of the Treasury. Hull was reluctant to give up his Senate seat for a Cabinet office. He was a national personage, had figured prominently as a candidate for President in the 1928 Democratic convention. Anxious to get Hull in the Cabinet, Mr. Roosevelt telephoned a close friend in Chattanooga to have pressure brought on the Tennessee Senator. Thereupon, Hull made it plain that if he went into the Cabinet he wanted it understood that he had no intention of becoming "anybody's office boy." At length, he agreed and Mr. Roosevelt invited him to take over the State Department.

When he did so, a few facts stood out in bold relief. Despite the contrary testimony of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, he still had courage enough to talk about the danger of the reckless Republican tariff policy. For years he had preached the doctrine that prosperity depends upon stable trade among nations as well as individuals, and that any policy tending to disrupt trade relations impairs national economic security, leads to international misunderstanding, and finally to war. He found that the United States was willing to extend credit to sister nations, but it was not willing to swap goods. He

had warned against the Fordney-McCumber Act and, later, against the Hawley-Smoot Act. He pointed out that the credit we were extending to European, South American and Asiatic nations was being used largely for internal reconstruction, and that little of it found its way back into American channels. When the crash came many, who previously had been skeptical, were ready to admit that Hull was right.

With this background, Hull became Secretary of State. His first stab at the complicated problem of our foreign relations—the London Economic Conference—ended in a failure. He went to London in 1933 to discuss exchange stabilization, but found European statesmen more willing to discuss war debts.

When Mr. Roosevelt placed Raymond Moley in the State Department, many made the mistake of concluding that Moley was its actual, Hull its nominal, head. Soon there was a showdown indicating the contrary.

Then George Peek, A.A.A. administrator and special advisor to President Roosevelt on foreign trade, sought to challenge Hull's trade program. Hull met the challenge and Peek was soon eased out of the Administration. After these two encounters official Washington began to change its opinion of the Secretary of State.

In December of 1933 Hull set out for Montevideo to attempt to establish in South America trade agreements which had not been achieved in London. Pickets met his boat carrying placards denouncing the Yankee traders. Dropping all diplomatic formalities, Hull, accompanied by an interpreter, made personal calls upon the delegations attending the Pan-American Conference.

"I'm Hull from the United States," he told them. He put it on a friendly man-to-man basis and delegation after delegation became convinced of his sincerity, concluding that under Hull diplomacy the "good neighbor" policy meant what it said.

Hull laid the groundwork for abrogation of the thirty-five year old Platt amendment which had given the United States virtual control over the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba. The effect of this in Latin America was tremendous.

Through recent years, little by little, the reciprocal trade pacts which Hull sponsored and, one by one, has concluded have become known as major accomplishments of the Roosevelt Administration. In testimony of their wisdom and effectiveness, the United States Senate a few weeks ago extended the trade pact legislation for three years. That was another feather in the Secretary's cap.

Since he has been in the State Department, Secretary Hull has steadfastly declined to make utterances on domestic politics. Many have guessed that he is too conservative to be in full sympathy with the New Deal. That he neither denies nor admits. He feels that, to best serve as minister of foreign affairs, he must remain aloof from internal politics.

Hull is not an accomplished orator. His somewhat squeaky voice is a drawback to him on the platform, but his sincerity and plain words usually prove effective.

As the 1940 Democratic convention approaches it is interesting to note that Hull holds the confidence of many of the nation's editors. CURRENT HISTORY recently conducted a poll of all the editors of daily newspapers in the United States. One question asked was: "Who should be nominated for President by the Democratic party?" The report in the April issue of CURRENT HISTORY reveals that 33.96 per cent of the editors answered Hull; 25.83 per cent answered Garner; 17.08 per cent, Roosevelt; 5.42 per cent, Wheeler; 3.33 per cent McNutt.

In Hull's native State the liberal wing of the Democratic and Republican parties favor Roosevelt's re-election should he desire to run, but they think he will not, and in that event they favor Hull, probably with Farley as a running mate. Farley visited Tennessee early in April and let it be known that he would like to see a Hull-for-President boom started in that State. He found many Tennesseans sympathetic. Hull is the No. 1 choice now in Tennessee—or would be if it were not that Tennessee Democrats know he will not be a candidate should Mr. Roosevelt decide to run for a third term.

Fitzpatrick, St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Doing business under difficulties.

Qualifications for the Presidency

Today the U. S. demands that its President supply a leadership which is positive in thought and action

HAROLD J. LASKI
Professor of Political Economy, the University of London

WHAT are the qualities essential for a President of the United States?

Above all, I think, the power to handle men, the ability almost intuitively to recognize the efficient human instrument for his purpose. That power has been more rare than is usually imagined. Lincoln, though he had an amazing insight into character, was never able to discover those instruments; no small part of the history of his administration is the record of his painful effort to transcend the results of that situation. Franklin Roosevelt has possessed it, as he showed when he chose, in remarkable circumstances, Mr. Ickes to be his Secretary of the Interior. Woodrow Wilson lacked it very largely; and no doubt a good deal of his final tragedy was due to that lack. So, also, did Calvin Coolidge; and he thereby prepared the road which led to the depression.

There is need for a President to come to office not only with a sense of the general direction in which he wishes to move, but with a sense, also, of the direction in which the times require him to move. Mr. Coolidge knew that he wished to pursue a policy of masterly inactivity; he assumed that the less he hampered the activities of business men the more prosperous would be the position of the country. The result of that attitude was an encouragement of speculative finance which he did not know enough to check at the right time, and which had assumed such proportions by the time Mr. Hoover took office that it is doubtful whether the latter would have been in a position to check it even if he had wished to do so.

And a President, further, must be able to think and decide rapidly; time is of the essence of perhaps half of his decisions. He needs not only the pertinacity to abide by them when they are made, but the instinct

which tells him both when to give way and when he may wisely return to a policy about which he has been compelled at one stage to give way. Few things better illustrate this sense of time than President Wilson's approach to the problem of American intervention in the War of 1914. He created an atmosphere in which the mass of the people was persuaded to accept his view that intervention was inescapable; and he took, accordingly, a practically united people into the war. Had he acted much before he did, that psychological success would have been dubious enough at least to risk the chance of his reelection in 1916.

The same quality is apparent in Franklin Roosevelt's handling of the neutrality issue. Again and again his search for the acceptance of his own formulae of international policy has been baffled by the dislike of the American people for European entanglements. Again and again, also, the President has utilized the changing circumstances to drive home the necessity of his view. If it be said that his problem has been rendered easier by the brutality of German and Italian policy since 1933, it has been rendered constantly more difficult by American doubt, which he may himself conceivably have shared, whether the governments of France and England read into his formulae the same ends as he sought to secure.

The presidential ability to coordinate is fundamental; and this largely depends upon the ability to distinguish between the significant and the insignificant. The President who cannot delegate, and trust when he has delegated, is lost. For the most part, he can only concern himself with outlines; the details of the picture must be filled in by subordinates. He must know that the men he uses will see things through his eyes. He must feel confident not only that they will not bother him unduly, but even more that they will refer back to him at the point where his pressure only can produce the required result. He must delegate, too, knowing that at best he is bound to make mistakes both in men and in things. This is above all the case in matters of foreign policy. There, he is dependent upon the eyes and ears of men who, however skilfully he chooses them, will be less under his control and influence in Paris or London than in Washington. And the men to whom he delegates complicate his problem because they must delegate in their turn.

Yet, after all, the main problem for the President is his relation to that queer, shifting, labyrinthine amalgam we call public opinion. An average President is likely to be a man in early middle age; Theodore Roosevelt, who became President accidentally at forty-three, is the only man, so far, to have attained the office under the age of forty-five. He ought, therefore, to be at the height of his powers, old enough to have maturity of experience, still young enough to bring energy to its interpretation. But, as he sets about his

task, there are certain things he is constrained to remember. Most of the problems he will encounter are, in their ultimate foundations, shaped for him by the great, impersonal forces of past history; he will be able, proportionately, whatever his ability and energy and good will, to affect them in but a small way. He will be dealing with people who, on any showing, are mainly wrapped up in their private lives. They will find the bridge from their particular to his universal through the special interests of the environment in which those lives are enfolded. He will be dealing, too, with a people which is still externally, rather than internally, conscious of its unity, which can still be made only through a gigantic effort to think upon a national plane.

PERHAPS only two peoples, the Greeks and the British, have been more politically minded than the American; yet, to most of them, the drama of politics is compelling in an interstitial, rather than in a wholesale, way. Indeed, it is almost true to say of them that they are interested rather because things go wrong than because things go right. The harvest is so abundant that prices fall; and the farmer looks suspiciously to see what the government proposes to do. The Stock Exchange is sluggish; and its votaries look around for presidential measures they may blame. The miners have gone on strike, and the winter coal supply is in danger; all eyes are turned on the White House to see how the President will tackle the threatened scarcity. The war clouds lower in Europe; what action will the President take to dispel them? Somehow, he has to transcend the hundred forces, the thousand voices, which compete to turn attention away from, or against, his central purposes. He has to seek the means of making men think his way, rather than another way. How far is it possible?

How far, moreover, is it a possible task in the light of certain facts that the observer is too prone to forget? He is President of the United States; but, in all probability, something like 40 per cent of the voting electorate has thought he ought not to be President, is ready, therefore, even eager, to be convinced that the case against him has been decisively made. He is President of the United States; but a very considerable portion of those who voted for him feel that it is an essential part of his function not to compel them again to take an interest in politics until the next time they have to vote. Thinking government always provokes a maximum resentment against itself, since the first thing upon which men economize is thought. He faces, too, on any showing, an opposition which will exhaust all the resources ingenuity can invent, and money can buy, to represent all he does, and most of the things he does not do, in the worst possible light. He is President of the United States; but more people know intimately the habits of their favorite movie star, or the record of the outstanding baseball player of the season, than know his policies.

He is dealing all the time with those forces of tradition it is so difficult to move and so troublesome indirectly to circumvent. He is asking all the time, also, for an attention that demands effort, and often action, from people whose instinct it is to remain spectators, even aloof spectators, of the drama in which he is principal actor. He has to deal with indifferent people and angry people, with the ambitious and the disappointed, with the cynical and the corrupt, as well as with those who are genuinely affected with a disinterested zeal for the public good. Only too often, he finds himself the victim of events he cannot control.

Yet he starts with advantages that are important, if he knows how to capitalize them. For five months before his election he has been the central figure in the public attention. He has the opportunity to create expectancies. He has the power to compel discussion. What he has to say, the very minutiae of his personality, will be the theme of talk in twenty million homes. Around him and his plans are a myriad hopes and fears. His problem is to maintain all he can of the tempo of those months. The answer to his problem lies in his having continuously something real to say, something positive and significant to do. The experience of the New Deal has shown, I think, decisively what an immense impact the personality of a President can make when he is able to arouse and retain the conviction that something of real importance is afoot.

WHATEVER his effect upon Congress, a President who can get to the multitude will seize the attention of the multitude. His ideas, his policies, his purposes, will shape the mental climate as will those of no other man in America. He must, of course, be persistent in keeping them to the fore. He must convey the sense that the victory of his purposes is really of importance; and the best way to convey that sense is to fight battles in which both his supporters and his opponents alike feel that his victory really is important. That, it may be noted, has been the secret of much of the hold President Franklin Roosevelt has maintained over his electorate. He has gone for the big things; he has dramatized the issues upon which men know that their lives depend. He has communicated his own eagerness to those upon whose interest he has to rely. The enthusiasm of his supporters, the hate, even, of his opponents, have given a color to his term of office that has influenced millions to whom the spectacle is rarely of itself arresting. He has known how to prick men into thought, not least to prick the younger generation into thought. Because he has himself cared so much, he has made others care too.

That quality, it is important to note, has been characteristic of every significant President in the record. It is true of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Lincoln, of Theodore Roosevelt, of Woodrow Wilson. They were all positive Presidents. They had a policy to recommend which seemed to their generation a challenge. Their supporters were, because of this, something more than the little regiment of professional politicians to whom the battle is significant for its spoils. They were, as in a war, an army of enthusiastic volunteers whose public interest in the outcome transcended their private inclination to aloofness.

The leader's passion has communicated itself to his followers. He has aroused the dynamic of democracy, an energy, when aroused, more powerful and pervasive than the dynamic of any other form of state.

THE President who can arouse this will make his policies a central thread in the life of the electorate. To do so, his effort must be a challenge. It must look forward and not backward. It must arouse a quality of interest that is essentially moral and positive in its nature. To end slavery, to curb the money-power, to build the "new freedom," to establish, beyond peradventure, the foundations of the "New Deal"—these make their appeal to the impulse of the crusader in man. The President who can do this penetrates within and beyond the little private life of the individual and links him, through himself, to purposes felt as great. There is an exhilaration in the atmosphere, a sense of big things on foot, which lifts the individual out of himself. Anyone who compares the fierce tempo of American politics under Jackson with that of his successors up to Lincoln, or of the age of Coolidge and Harding with that of Franklin Roosevelt, will, I think, have some sense of what this dynamic of democracy can imply.

A President so far ahead of his time as to voice aspirations the common man is not yet ready to understand is inevitably doomed to failure. The kind of challenge that he must make is one for which history has already prepared a wide and secure foundation. It must seem immediately and recognizably desirable to a wide area of interests.

From this angle, it is easy to see the significance of President Franklin Roosevelt's attack on Wall Street. Therein was implied not only a definite program of reform but also the punishment of the men who were largely deemed responsible for the necessity of those reforms. In the first days of the New Deal, Wall Street could only have answered the challenge of the President had it been able, by the classic mechanisms of the free market, to overcome the gravity of the crisis. It would have had to establish recovery in order to stave off reform. Lacking the ability to do so, it transformed the reforming purpose into something akin to a religious crusade. It provided, the more it opposed reform, all the emotions of a drama in which each spectator felt himself associated with the fortunes of the actors involved. At its height, war and revolution provide that drama in its extreme form. In

more normal times, the task of the democratic statesman is to elicit sufficient of the emotion to give the feel of great purpose in play, with sufficient of restraint to prevent the precipitation of conflict.

THE government of a positive state must, if it is to be successful, necessarily be a thinking government. It cannot function adequately either if, as with Harding and Coolidge, it has Presidents with no ideas at all, or if, as with Mr. Hoover, it has a President whose fundamental philosophy is at variance with its implications. The party struggle in the positive state can safely afford to be built upon a difference of opinion about the rate of change; it cannot afford to be built upon a difference of opinion about the direction of change. Once it is so built over any considerable period of time the conflict between the interests that are battling for power becomes too intense to be compatible with the democratic process. The established expectations of men cannot then be satisfied within the framework of reasonal discussion, because one group will reject the assumptions upon which the other builds. We have seen in our own generation the outcome of rejection in Russia in 1917, in Italy in 1922, in Germany in 1933, in Spain in 1936. The positive state demands positive parties; and positive parties demand positive Presidents.

If a man is to be elected President on the principle of least offensiveness, he is likely, above all, to lack the positive qualities the modern President requires. A happy phrase of Mr. Robert Jackson, the Solicitor-General of the United States, puts with some precision what I have in mind. "I do not know," he told the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, "whether President Roosevelt is to have a third term; I do know that there must be a third term for the New Deal." Presidential candidates, in other words, must, increasingly, be capable of the kind of leadership the positive state and its problems require. "Availability" does not produce that kind of leadership. It destroys the possibility of thinking government. It is, by its nature, against the future; and, therefore, it is bound to dissatisfy the established expectations of the present. As the new America unfolds its possibilities, the party which stands by the doctrine of "availability" may win an occasional victory; but it will condemn itself, I think inevitably, to long periods in which it is excluded from power.

For the "available" President will have offered too many hostages to fortune before election to strike out a strong line of his own; his power effectively to lead will have been stricken into impotence before it has got under way. That will mean that though he is President the effective center of policy will be in Congress and not in the White House. That means not merely that there will be no creative central direction of purpose; it means, also, by the nature of what Congress is, the service of sectional interest rather than the service—so urgently required—of national need. For nothing but strong leadership from the President can give to Con-

(Continued on page 61)

Mrs. Smith Goes to Chicadelphia

An article which reveals the whys and wherefores of an American phenomenon—a National Convention

GORDON HAMILTON

THE presiding officer of the district political club listened patiently to committee reports before he called on Mrs. John Smith to speak. She had been selected by her district leader to run in the primary for delegate to her party's national convention.

An insurgent politician had branded her as a Communist, a wheelhorse of the county chairman and a stooge for one presidential aspirant. She made a vigorous denial. To prove her orthodoxy she quoted from previous speeches. She recalled her industry in getting out the vote. She pledged herself to serve as a true representative of her district voters:

"When I am elected, I will conduct a poll to determine the sentiment of the people in my district. I will find the man who my constituents believe is the best man for President of the United States and I will be for that man. At the same time I believe in encouraging each of the candidates to make speeches and work for his own nomination so as to build up the biggest possible interest for our party among the public."

In the primary, Mrs. Smith was decisively elected: a tribute to her independent stand, she thought, until she realized that a fellow candidate had been elected by exactly the same margin, though he had admitted he would vote just as his county chairman advised.

During the interval before the convention, Mrs. Smith studied the careers of the aspirants for the presidential nomination, wading through speeches, digesting claims of campaign managers, testing the sentiment of her district.

She learned that past conventions had set a precedent for certain qualifications for presidential candidates: Since the Civil War the average age of the candidates has been fifty-three years. The youngest candidate ever nominated was William Jennings Bryan in 1896 who was thirty-six,

John D. Hamilton, Chairman of the Republican National Committee

only one year older than the constitutional minimum. The youngest ever elected was Theodore Roosevelt, who was forty-five in 1904. Mrs. Smith knew that every presidential candidate had been a Protestant except Al Smith, who was Catholic. She found out that the Republican party had never renominated a defeated candidate and that the Democratic party had done so only three times—Bryan twice, Cleveland once.

She read that no candidate from either party had been a Southerner since the Civil War and only one had come from the Far West, Herbert Hoover. Candidates usually came from populous, politically doubtful states in the East or Middle West. Eleven of eighteen Republican conventions since the Civil War had nominated Ohioans. Every Democratic nominee since 1920 had been a New Yorker. Of the candidates of both parties since the Civil War, all except four—who were all defeated—had previously held high political office—like senator, governor, cabinet minister.

The day of the national convention drew near. Mrs. Smith piled into a special train crowded with party warhorses whom she had met at benefits and meetings—district leaders and office-holders, "money-bags" and elder statesmen. She shook hands with the white hope for the governorship and the dark horse for the senatorship and the favorite son for the presidency.

Many in the party were veterans of past conventions. One-third were professional politicians; another third were lawyers; the rest were just people. Few had any set convictions about any one candidate—even their own favorite son—but were prepared to follow the lead of the head of the delegation. Some hoped to pick the winning candidate at the start and lead the scramble for the bandwagon. Others insisted that the delegation should stick to its favorite son until a deadlock created a greater value for its vote.

Mrs. Smith was puzzled by the status of the favorite son. Her delegation had gone on record as favoring his nomination, but most of the delegates openly admitted their willingness to bolt at the first opportunity. Some delegations were uninstructed for any candidate, she learned, while others were either pledged or advised by primaries to vote for one aspirant.

While on the train, Mrs. Smith drank up all the political dope she could. She learned that the Republican convention had an even 1,000 votes to the Democratic 1,094, more than half the delegates in each case being chosen by party conventions, most of the rest by primaries and a few by state committees. It was explained how some delegates got only a half vote, because, that way, more people got to go to the big party.

Mrs. Smith could not quite understand why the Solid South, which rarely or never voted for a Republican candidate, was represented at the Republican party's convention, just as rock-ribbed Republican Maine and

Vermont, which hadn't even voted for President Roosevelt in 1936, were still allowed to take part in the Democratic fun in 1940.

She knew that the key states were New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio, since those, the most populous, had the most votes. But it was news to Mrs. Smith that even Alaska, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands sent delegates to the conventions, though they could not vote in the election.

She began to realize that Philadelphia had won the Republican convention for June 24, 1940, not because it was the scene of the party's first national convention in 1856, but because it had offered $250,000. She understood why the Democratic party, which always held its convention after the Republicans, had delayed its meeting until July 15 in Chicago—favorite convention city which had seen sixteen presidential candidates nominated since the Civil War and had won the Democrats this year with a bid of $130,000.

But Mrs. Smith did not see why the cities were so generous—until she heard that old story about the Tennessee Democrat who sold a cow for $4 just before going to a convention and promptly paid $4 for a beefsteak dinner.

As the train pulled into the convention city, Mrs. Smith found that the committee on arrangements, after slaving for months, had done its job so well that the convention was no more disorganized than a circus a few hours before it opens. The arrangement committee had hired the bands, assigned the hotel rooms, arranged the seating of delegates.

As she stepped off the train, brass bands blared, badges advertising some candidate or other were pinned on every lapel, and headquarters had been established for each aspirant. Ten gallon hats of Westerners mixed with derbies of city slickers; wrinkled clothes of liberals with tailored suits of conservatives; soft accents and nasal twangs blended in a bedlam. Mrs. Smith wondered how, out of this confusion, a united party could agree on one candidate.

She had imagined that she was going to the convention to make up her own mind about the best candidate. Instead, she found herself drifting into a state of helplessness. She was soon only too glad to take advice.

The meeting of her state delegation reassured her. It was called to order by the state chairman and by chorused "ayes" and "nays" chose a leader, who selected the state's representatives on the committees of the convention. Unlike some other delegations, this one pledged itself to vote by the unit rule, which meant that if 51 per cent of the members favored a certain candidate, all of the votes of the state would be cast for him. Now at last she knew what she was doing—or, at any rate, what was being done with her. She felt a sense of collective power and influence.

At last the national convention opened. The delegates streamed into the hall, chatted in the aisles. Eventually the go-getting gentleman she had met on one of his trips as chairman of the National Committee gavelled the mob to order. The invocation by a clergyman, selected by the committee on arrangements, was followed by the singing of the "Star-Spangled Banner" by a theatrical star and by the delegates who fumbled for the words and the high notes. Then "Onward, Christian Soldiers" echoed from the rafters.

Thereafter came the election of a temporary chairman, or keynoter, recommended by the committee on arrangements two months earlier. She did not quite see why a temporary chairman was needed when the chairman of the National Committee was doing an effective job of presiding, but knew that if one candidate was ahead of the others he usually tried to have a temporary chairman chosen from his own camp. Just as she was expecting to hear high-flowing oratory which would inspire her and the rest of the party workers, the convention recessed. The speech was withheld for evening to be broadcast over nationwide hook-ups at a time when most radios are turned on.

James A. Farley, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee

When the convention reassembled, Mrs. Smith was inspired by the keynote address. Then came minor bits of business. Temporary officers—secretary, sergeant-at-arms, tally clerk—were chosen. Temporary rules were adopted. Standing committees were named, with one member from each delegation to pass on credentials, rules and order of business, permanent organization, and resolutions.

The credentials committee decided disputes between rival delegations. Here, she knew, was a chance for undercover bickering. Such a preliminary test of strength, she had heard, occurred most notably at the 1932 Democratic convention when, over strong objections, the pro-Roosevelt Huey Long delegation from Louisiana was seated.

The rules committee was unexciting to Mrs. Smith, although back in 1936 it had provided the chief battle at the Democratic national convention by abolishing the 104-year-old rule, established since 1832, requiring a two-thirds rather than majority vote to choose a candidate for President.

The committee on permanent organization chose the permanent chairman, previously recommended by the arrangements committee. This gave a chance for another straw-vote test of strength—each camp wanted a chairman favorable to its side to rule the unruly convention.

At the national convention, the permanent chairman delivered a speech, but his main duties, Mrs. Smith could see, were to be a strict disciplinarian and a master of parliamentary procedure. The resolutions committee wrote the platform.

Mrs. Smith was not admitted to the inner sanctums of committee rooms. She knew what occured inside them from the newspapers. She read that one favorite son was losing ground, that a dark horse was being trotted out, that her own delegation was wavering—all news to her. She could see only one ring of the seven-ring circus that filled so many newspaper columns—old timers could tell her that in a relatively unexciting convention like the Republican convention in 1936, four million words

(Continued on page 57)

Bata at Belcamp

Czech shoe manufacturer, master of mass production, opens an ultra-modern factory in the United States

ALFRED HENDERSON

FIFTY years ago a lad stood with his father outside the door of an ancient inn at Zlin, in Bohemia, thinking wistfully of bread and cheese and the hospitality within. His father, a poor village shoemaker, diverted his attention to the one tall chimney in the hamlet, rising beside the local sugar mill, and said: "My son, some day you shall own a chimney like that."

Thomas Bata, the boy who once craved a bit of bread and cheese, lived to rule an industrial empire, overcoming poverty, defying shocks of war, defeating the dreariness of depression. He lived, not only to build great factories in Zlin, but to create an industrial system without parallel in the world.

In Belcamp, Maryland, a flag stop on the outskirts of Baltimore, there is a new factory today, and new jobs are in the making for American workers, because the capital of the shoe empire which Bata built at Zlin has fallen into the hands of conquerors.

Belcamp represents nearly forty years of industrial achievement under the Bata system. C.I.O.'s United Shoe Workers of America maintain that Belcamp also represents an attempt to "transplant foreign standards and foreign working conditions onto American soil." A.F.L.'s older Boot and Shoe Workers Union denounces the Bata company as an "enemy of labor" and the new enterprise as a "threat to American living standards." Domestic shoe manufacturers deplore the addition of another large production unit to an industry which, they say, is already in a condition of overproduction.

This is not the first experience of the Batas in America. Thomas Bata came to this country in 1904 to study the methods of the world's greatest shoe industry. With a few associates from the Zlin factory, he lived and worked in Lynn, Massachusetts, then center of the women's shoe industry

Jan Bata

in the United States. Months later he returned to Bohemia to introduce mass shoe production and to develop an even more intensified system of "assembly line" shoemaking than was known in the United States.

Ten years later, at the outbreak of the World War, the Zlin factory was commandeered by Austria and its 6,000-pair-a-day production utilized for the armies of the Emperor. Again Thomas and his associates found refuge in Lynn, established a small factory there and were feted and honored by the city. At the close of the war, ancient Bohemia threw off the yoke of the Hapsburgs and Thomas Bata returned to the new-born republic of Czecho-Slovakia.

In 1922 the business was faced with complete disaster. It was then that Thomas Bata astounded Central Europe and his own employees by a bold stroke which cleared him of the economic tangle of that troubled time.

"We are going to have a bad time," he told his workmen, "but we can weather it if we stand together. You stand by me and I'll stand by you. Prices and wages must go down but I guarantee that you shall not suffer."

A 50 per cent reduction in selling prices promptly followed, accompanied by a 40 per cent slash in wages. In order to fulfill his promise to his employees, Bata established a commissary at Zlin where food, clothing, and other necessaries might be obtained at 50 per cent of their cost elsewhere. He built dormitories where the workmen could obtain shelter and food at equally reduced prices. The famous system was under way.

In 1929, and again in 1937, America's shoe manufacturers demanded protection against Bata footwear imported from Czecho-Slovakia; winning the first round when President Hoover upped the prevailing tariff in 1930, and losing the second in 1938, when Secretary of State Hull's trade treaty with Czecho-Slovakia was concluded.

Until the day of his sudden death in an airplane crash near Zlin in 1932, Thomas Bata was the force behind the expanding shoe empire, and its undisputed ruler. Jan Bata, a stepbrother of Thomas, succeeded to the throne. "The Bata system, faced with the depression and the loss of its leader, cannot live," its critics predicted in 1932. But Jan Bata accepted the role of "first worker" of the vast organization, declaring war on the "common enemy, the poverty of the working man." The new leader followed successfully in the footsteps of the founder.

The Bata method of shoemaking is a development of mass production to the nth degree. The route followed by the product through the factories is never crossed or interrupted and manufacturing departments do not overlap. Automatic conveyor systems and huge production complete the Bata method.

Critics assert that it enslaves employees to a machine, speeding them up to keep pace with the mechanical movements of the conveyors. However, to Jan Bata it represents emancipation of laborers at their work.

"In the old days," he said recently, "a man bent over his work all day. When he had finished his day's work his back was exhausted. Now, a man stands erect, and reaches right and left as he works. He stands like a man, not like the apes."

Shoe experts agree that Bata is a master of progressive shoemaking, and that the introduction of the Bata method in the American industry may change shoemaking methods in every large factory in the United States within the next decade. The "system" also may have a far-reaching influence on American industry as a whole.

CONDENSED FROM A RECENT SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN KARL STEFAN OF NEBRASKA

With eight to ten million people unemployed, every encouragement should be given to any new enterprise which will give men and women employment. Because of the drought which has existed in my district for several years, hundreds are unemployed there, living on relief. Most of these people want to work and improve their own homes, provide a living for their families and a future for their children. A factory similar to the one Bata constructed in Belcamp, Maryland, would be a godsend to the people of my district.

Jan Bata, who is interested in opening a factory in Nebraska, stated that the importance of the export phase may be seen from the fact that heretofore the Bata factories in Czecho-Slovakia alone have supplied the foreign markets with approximately twenty million pairs of shoes annually. It was contemplated that the transfer of manufacture to the United States would finally result in the employment of not less than five thousand Americans. This would mean an annual payroll in excess of $5,000,000. It would mean a great increase in employment in all allied industries. It was planned that all operations be carried on by American labor.

Twenty thousand workmen rising at "Reveille," dressing with military dispatch, and leaving their quarters in Bata barracks for assembly at the factory mess hall, is the picture painted for the start of a work day at Belcamp in the near future. Twenty thousand workers, breakfast over, marching in orderly ranks to their workshops, where busy machines will hum through the day until it is time to reassemble for evening mess—so the picture unfolds. Twenty thousand workers with a few hours leave to spend in the community amusement center in the evening, until early "Taps" sends them to bed.

This picture of laboring puppets unquestionably is overdrawn. Nevertheless it is recognizably similar to the activities at Zlin, and wherever else the 40,000 employees work in Bata factories, live in Bata dormitories and homes, and conform strictly to the Bata plan.

The shoeworkers of Zlin are largely youthful peasants from remote villages of Slovakia and eastern Ruthenia. Older workers traveled to Zlin, too, to seek bounty of the shoe magnate, but few remained long. The pace of Bata shoemaking is too strenuous for all but the youthful and strong. All new workers at Zlin are housed in Bata dormitories, and made to conform to rigid Bata rules. Every hour in the day of the student employees is absolutely regulated by the company.

Students are carefully trained in Bata shoemaking methods and advanced according to a set system. At the end of their training period they become regular workers. The company stresses the fact that they are free to leave and work elsewhere if they wish. However, the training is highly specialized to conform with Bata methods and they would have difficulty in finding work with any other employer in the industry.

Each group of workmen in a department of a Bata factory operates as a unit. Each member of a group is equally responsible for the quantity and quality of the work produced by the unit. Four wage plans are in effect: (1) Individual piece work, whereby each operator is paid for the amount of work produced, as is customary in American factories. About 16 per cent of the employees were so paid according to the latest reliable estimates. (2) Collective piece work, whereby workers receive a share of the compensation paid for the output of the unit. About 50 per cent work under this plan. (3) A fixed wage per week. (4) Wages with participation in the profits or losses of the firm.

The average wage paid in Zlin is claimed to be "approximately $15.00 per week" (a high figure for the Czecho-Slovakian industry). American shoeworkers receive an average wage of $23.00. Wages at the Bata factory in Britain are said to be "higher than those paid to union labor in Great Britain."

The company has stated that Bata employees work on a forty hour, five day week basis. However, the working time is fixed by a daily "stint" of work to be done, and not by the clock. The work day actually ends when the work is done—not when the whistle blows.

Of course, there can be no such flexibility of wages and hours in Belcamp, under the National Labor Relations Act and the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. Bata must maintain the same labor relations and pay the same minimum wages as his competitors here. He will be closely watched by the A.F.L. and C.I.O. shoeworkers' unions.

Outside the factories at Zlin, Bata workers live under a system of feudalism—new style. The modern hostels and comfortable homes provided for them are not to be compared with the dreary company-owned shacks which shrink shamefully along the streets of many an American mill town. Yet the cheery, modern dwellings of Zlin are ruled with an iron hand, even if it is directed by a beneficent heart.

Thomas Bata said of his workers' homes in Zlin: "They don't care anything about individuality. They have the essential comforts,—bathrooms, electric light, space and air. If they want variety they can have it in their gardens." Only in the "essential comforts" does this philosophy differ from that which has spotted many American mill towns with row on row of shed-like, colorless homes.

Bata is in the grocery, clothing, real estate and recreation businesses, as well as the business of manufacturing footwear. The company operates rubber factories, tanneries, paper mills, stocking factories, machine shops, and countless other auxiliary works. Employees are insured against sickness, accidents, invalidism and old age. They are given annual vacations with pay. They pay 55 cents to $1.50 a week for dwellings of from three to six rooms. There are nearly 4,000 of these homes, each with bath, water, gas and electricity. Most of them have gardens.

Single employees are lodged in hostels or are provided with fully furnished accommodations. Food is supplied in special dining rooms of the Bata hotel and stores at Zlin, at prices as low as 5 cents for lunch and 10 cents for dinner.

Only one American shoe manufacturer has a community program in any way comparable with that of Bata. The Endicott-Johnson Corporation, second largest shoe manufacturer in the United States, has established hospitals, diners, markets, parks, playgrounds, and recreational activities for its workers, and has built hundreds of homes in the Susquehanna Valley. The difference—and it is a big difference—is that the use of these facilities, and the purchase of these homes, at cost, is purely voluntary.

Bata, on the contrary, never denied that he operated a "one man show" at Zlin and that Bata workers lived, worked and played as he planned. That, he felt, was their only salvation from drudgery and drab tradition.

The new factory in Maryland is built according to the same plan as the parent factory at Zlin. The workers' homes, forty of which will be two-family dwellings, with ten additional, are being constructed as the nucleus for a community similar to that of Zlin. The houses will be as like as peas in a pod.

The first unit of the Belcamp factory is now in operation, and other units are to follow rapidly. The company is also planning to buy or build a tannery to manufacture much of the leather it will use, and expects to import many hides to meet requirements.

Students from the Hartford County, Maryland, high schools are receiving instruction from Zlin experts. Two hundred and fifty American youths are being trained in Bata methods at Belcamp. They form the nucleus of 2,000 workers who will be employed there this year, and of probably ten times that number who will answer the Bata "Reveille" in the future.

Thomas Bata was a foe of Communism, and Jan Bata's hatred of Nazism burned deep long before the occupation of his native Bohemia by the armies of Hitler. He was the largest contributor to the $100,000,-000 defense fund raised in Czecho-Slovakia just before its fall.

Denounced as a Jew, in spite of birth certificates and family records

Hide and Leather and Shoes Photo

The first unit of the Bata Shoe Company erected at Belcamp, Maryland.

dating back over three hundred years, proving his "Aryan" ancestry, Jan Bata infuriated the Nazis by declaring that, while he was not a Jew, under the circumstances he would be proud if he were.

When the Swastika was raised over Zlin, Jan Bata was discreetly winging through the air in his private plane bound for the refuge of Bucharest, Rumania. A few weeks later he was recalled to Zlin to resume management of the factories. He did so under an "arrangement" with the Nazi government, which, he reported, was "satisfactory." The hand of Nazi friendship was extended to the Czech industrialist only because no other man could have kept the mammoth works from dissolution. Destruction of the shoe empire is not in Nazi plans.

Now Bata comes to America shunning the spotlight of publicity, but stirring speculation both within the shoe industry and without. The 2,000-acre tract at Belcamp—desolate and undeveloped—was purchased by Bata shortly after President Hoover's tariff boost. He planned to build a factory and reenter the American footwear market as a domestic manufacturer.

From time to time there were rumors that the plant would be built at once. But Bata was busy with his factories in France, Holland, India, England, Germany, and more distant countries. He opened a chain of retail stores in the Chicago area, and shipped enough shoes to America to keep his markets open for future development.

Through the Thirties women's shoes were changing. The McKay construction which had been featured by Bata in America during the Twenties, and on which the increased tariff rates applied, was fast supplanted by the newer cemented process. This was not covered by the duty increase of 1930, and Bata was quick to discover the fact. Czech shoes again poured into the American market. Bata's American retail chain was expanded. In three or four years imports doubled and trebled—to the dismay of New England manufacturers.

Meanwhile, Secretary of State Hull was negotiating treaties with one country after another, hopeful of expanding world trade. At the announcement of the intended trade pact with Czecho-Slovakia, the billion dollar American shoe and leather industry rose in arms. Secretary Hull pointed out that shoe imports from Czecho-Slovakia (practically all from Bata factories) were insignificant in comparison with the production of the domestic industry. But these imports of one type of shoe almost exclusively, amounted to 20 per cent of domestic production of that kind. In the end, the treaty was concluded and Bata imports were protected by a

binding of the existing duty on cemented shoes. The tariff was to be reconsidered when imports rose above 1.25 per cent of total domestic production.

What effects this treaty might have had will never be known. A few months later, Hitler quietly annexed the Sudeten section of Czecho-Slovakia.

The Bata factories at Zlin and Batov are more than 250 miles from the Sudeten district. But, while the shoe empire escaped disaster when the Sudetenland was taken, confusion, uncertainty, and anxiety in Central Europe hampered its operations. Exports to America from Zlin fell off.

Then, in March, 1939, all Czecho-Slovakia passed into the hands of the German Reich and with it went the capital of the Bata empire, the main plant at Zlin.

Looking for a new seat of empire, Jan Bata could find but two countries where mass shoe production methods might be successful: England and America. He was already established in England, but several factors combined to make America a more desirable location for the "new Zlin."

Bata owned the still undeveloped tract in Maryland. He had many friends and business acquaintances in America. He and his brother before him had learned much about shoemaking in America. He had already tasted the richness of the American markets. He knew that American working men are not easily alarmed by highly organized mass production methods, are not unaccustomed to a semblance of feudalism in industrial communities. If many here may doubt Bata, many also respect his genius and daring.

Immediately after the fall of Czecho-Slovakia, he was invited to Lynn, Lowell, and other shoemaking centers. All were anxious to secure new shoe factories to aid their unemployed. None of these places interested Bata. On the Belcamp site he could build his factories and communities in the Bata manner, from the ground up. He did not want the skilled workers of the old shoe centers, but untrained youths who could be made not only shoeworkers but Bata workers.

At Belcamp, Jan Bata told interviewers that only the one plant would be established in this country. He parried every question about the fate of Zlin and the financial structure of the American project. Reputedly backed by assets of $300,000,000, he disclaims knowledge of such backing. Considered a foe of bank financing, he did not deny that his empire is largely financed by British and American banking interests. He also refused to discuss Hitler, and said that his visit was only temporary.

International News Photo

Homes for Bata workers, consisting of two and one half room apartments that rent for $5 a week. Workers' cars are shown in the foreground.

He was most anxious, however, to explain his philosophy of work. It was under the trees that will soon shade the streets of a new Zlin at Belcamp that he told of his dreams to "build men as well as shoes." He stretched in the shade and visualized approvingly the future town outlined on a roll of paper before him. Winding walks were outlined on that paper, wide streets, playground areas, parks, bathing beaches, stores, community centers, factories, and homes.

"Fatter pay envelopes can't take the place of cultural and educational advantages," he declared, as he explained his belief that industrialists should be benefactors. "We have been taught to do unto others as we would have others do unto us. Briefly, that's the idea of Belcamp."

The shoe manufacturers' opposition to Bata is based on the belief that established factories are now producing more shoes than can be absorbed by the domestic markets, or by existing export markets. If Bata follows his present intentions he will export about 30 to 50 per cent of the output of the Maryland factory, and of another Bata factory recently established in Canada. This, other manufacturers declare, is impossible. Nevertheless, the "impossible" has always lured Bata. He has already sold shoes to practically every known country. He has sent loaded ships to lands where the natives did not know what shoes looked like—and the ships returned to Zlin for more cargo.

For several years the United States has produced about 400,000,000 pairs of shoes annually. The per capita consumption of shoes here is slightly more than three pairs a year. However, approximately half of production and consumption are of shoes retailing at $2.00 a pair and less, having a natural wearing life of less than six weeks. Even the domestic market, therefore, may offer an opportunity for further development.

Bata is used to inducing people to buy more shoes than before—Bata shoes. His biggest export business was in grades retailing at about $2.00 in the United States. It is presumed he will make the same grades in Maryland. It is more than likely that he actually will add to total produc-

(Continued on page 62)

Friends at Work

The Quakers—how they grew and what they do in this troubled world, at home and abroad

ARTHUR POUND

Historian; author of The Penns of Pennsylvania and England, Detroit—Dynamic City, *etc.*

WHEN, a few weeks ago, it was announced that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, First Lady of the Land, would be sponsored commercially on the air by a soap company, eyebrows were lifted. First Lady, indeed! Radio, indeed! Soap, indeed! The more easily affronted section of the public, to say nothing of the opposition press, seemed all set to mount its high horse for a jolly canter.

Then came the reassuring news that Mrs. Roosevelt would give the proceeds of her soap-selling campaign to the American Friends Service Committee, as she had done on several previous occasions. Straightway, that made everything all right. There just couldn't be anything wrong about the President's wife doing a little work in order to help those wonderful Quakers. The public might still be a little hazy; but the newspaper editors and the well-to-do who support philanthropies knew a good deal about the Committee and its work here and abroad. So nearly everyone who had picked up a war-club laid it down again, and said, "Go it, Mrs. Roosevelt. The end justifies the means."

The American Friends Service Committee has been having a wonderful press of late; and not only in the dailies; the magazines have been outdoing themselves on this theme. Stanley High praised their work in *The Saturday Evening Post* with a regular old-time *Post* article of unlimited wordage, and Marc Rose in *Reader's Digest* followed with equal fervor, though at less length. Here were ace article men talking to the millions. Then, in the *Atlantic*, the former hero and moving spirit of the Service Committee, Professor Emeritus Rufus M. Jones of Haverford College, from whose chair of philosophy he teaches the world at large, was given the floor to talk directly to the literati and money-changers. Important stories also appeared in *Time* and *Woman's Home Companion.* All this editorial attention to the Quakers and their work flowed from something as near to admiration as disillusioned newspaper and magazine folk can muster. Chronically beset by "phonies," both personal and institutional, these authors and editors scrutinized the Friends' Committee and its work carefully before they said in effect: "By the Eternal, this is real! These Quaker fellows just don't seem to have any angle except that of helping humanity."

Mrs. Roosevelt came to the same conclusion. The Quakers aren't in the business of philanthropy for their own profit, power, or glory, either as persons or as a sect. Individuals ask you not to use their names in articles, and they never proselyte for converts. This reticence brings its rewards; it gets the Friends (or Quakers) behind the lines of warring and suspicious powers, into the confidence of the shy and ignorant poor, and—last but not least—into the consciences and pocketbooks of non-Quakers.

Before describing these results, remarkable achievements for so small and quiet a religious body, let me tell you what Quakers themselves think of their Service Committee efforts. This is a composite verdict arrived at after talking to several Quakers, both highly placed and humble in mundane activities.

They agree that the publicity which has come to their Committee is helpful to the work. But it is less helpful, they say, than it might be if Quakerism were better understood. Outside writers, rated too appreciative by these modest persons, describe deeds as miracles which are not miracles at all. Such writers profess wonder over slight successes in common sense and organization, of which all men are easily capable, if—.

Ah, the great *if!* If God is working with you, if the Inner Light is shining through you upon others and upon the road ahead, if you are nourished and sustained by the faith that good is infectious and a good deed goes on forever, passed from one person to another through Eternity!

Just as individual Quakers patiently disclaim credit for contributions of money or time to social service, so these who speak for the institutional body of Friends humbly push praise aside. They say: "This isn't a sect. It's a movement. A divine spirit, benign and strong beyond description, orders all things here and everywhere. We grasp only the tiniest corner of this sheltering cloak of limitless strength and wisdom. Other bodies of believers and seekers, whose faiths spring from the mystical experiences of other founders, have hold of this treasury of strength at other points. That is why we say that, in good works, the sect means little, the movement everything. That is why we believe that men and women working in Christian fellowship can do all things, because an untiring divinity works through them. That is why we weary of hearing that what we are doing is miraculous. We believe that our way of yielding to the divine is far easier

than the world's way of blocking Christian progress by meanness, cruelty, and war."

Friends talk this way to sympathetically inquiring strangers, of whose goodwill and understanding they feel reasonably sure. Faintly they hope that we who inquire will understand what they mean, even though they frequently use words to convey meanings no longer common. Among themselves they need never discuss these fundamentals, because Quakerism is still pretty much a family religion taught at the parental knee. But outsiders continue to be puzzled as to how this faith, which seems to multiply the strength of its possessors a hundredfold in good works, grew to its present influence, and why, in spite of its leadership in practical philanthropy, its adherents remain to this day only a handful—112,000 in America, about 130,000 in the entire world.

—Condensed from the foreword for the 1939 Annual Report for the American Friends Service Committee by Rufus M. Jones, Chairman

"In one of H. G. Wells' stories the hero of it has to spend a night in a house reputed to be haunted. When he entered the spooky house he found to his joy a row of candles burning, but he soon discovered that they were of different lengths and began to wink out one after the other, until finally the last one burned out and left him in the dark in his mysterious house!

"Our world this last year has seemed something like that. It has been crowded with mysteries enough and we have watched light after light go out.

"But love still 'lasts on' and it remains 'the greatest thing in the world.' The way of love is also the way of faith and hope, and it will in the end prove to be the way of peace . . . ."

As religious ideas go, Quakerism is as old as kindness, simplicity and truth. Historically it traces back to the mystic quietism and pietism of the Early Church. Germany was a mediaeval abiding place of these simple faiths, and to this day the Friends are in especial concord with two other pacifist denominations of direct German origin—the Mennonite Church and the Church of the Brethren or Dunkards. In a sense, Quakerism was the English expression of a yearning to seek God without guidance from a specially trained ministry, and to order one's life on a divine plan that paid no heed to rank or power.

These ideas, generating in the Puritan Revolution of the seventeenth century, found a voice in George Fox, a self-taught preacher of immense vigor and disciplinary power. His followers at first called themselves Friends of the Truth, which was soon changed to the Religious Society of Friends, still the official designation. Because they were admonished by one of their early leaders to tremble in the fear of the Lord, an English judge called them Quakers in 1658, and the quaint name stuck. By his death in 1691, Fox had given Quakerism substantially its present thought and content, at least in the essentials of faith and bearing.

In minor matters, there have been changes. Fox was stiffly "agin the government." His followers refused to take oaths of any kind, to pay tithes for the support of the Established Church or to attend its services, or to bear arms for the defense of the State under any circumstances. Holding all men equal in the sight of God, they refused to recognize titles of aristocracy or to doff their hats in the presence of their betters. Actually, these passive rebels were democrats of deepest dye; they refused to believe that any men were their betters. Thus, young William Penn refused to take off his hat to the King, even when the monarch obliged by giving him Pennsylvania. A stubborn lot, many Quakers went easily and prayerfully to prison; a number were martyred. Massachusetts executed two Quaker men and one Quaker woman for returning to Boston again and again to preach their faith.

Enthusiasm to win converts died out soon after persecution of Quakers ceased, and, left to themselves, the Quakers quit trying to save the world by direct action, and undertook to save themselves by quiet living, good works, and silent prayer. Until 1756 they controlled the Pennsylvania Assembly, but then withdrew because their representatives as public officials were required to appropriate and expend public funds in the conduct of war. Until then their cooperation in politics had been reckoned an outpouring of the spirit, a sanctification through participation. Formally renouncing public life in 1758, they then began to seek sanctification by emphasizing those elements in Quakerism that most obviously set them apart. These were dress, language and interpretation of the Scriptures. They sedulously retained and even enlarged the plain, broad-brimmed hat common to Fox's disciples in his own time. A cult of the hat developed, matched on the other side of the meeting house by a cult of the bonnet and plain dresses, gray or black, with a touch of white at the neck. In language, they used toward one another the quaint, old personal pronouns and adjectives, *thee* and *thou, thy* and *thine*. On the lips of birthright Quakers, these old, familiar terms seem truly to bespeak friendliness and Christian fellowship which, of course, is the real reason for their continued use.

In matters of discipline, the Quakers were always rather more forgiving toward outsiders than to members of "meeting," as the group of common worshippers was called. Marriage is by declaration of the contracting parties before the meeting, with all present signing the book as witnesses; if one married out of meeting the offender might be, usually was, "disowned"—the Quaker term for expulsion. Or, if a youth so far forgot himself as to take up arms for his country, as many did in every war from the Revolution onward, he would likewise be cast out.

A young Quaker who went to Cuba with the army in 1898 returned to find that his own parents had presided at a meeting which "disowned" him. At home, the subject was never mentioned; he was welcomed, nursed through a long illness due to tropical fever and cared for devotedly as a son, although unacceptable as a member of this sect which for nearly three hundred years has borne living testimony against war. Thus has their pacifism been maintained by tears and sacrifice. The "disowned" son went to meeting if and when he pleased; he never went elsewhere to worship, and if he had arisen to give testimony, probably no one would have objected. This he never did, however; it would have been a breach of congregational manners and, in addition, he was quite aware that no one would be impressed by whatever

he said. Religiously, he had been "sent to Coventry."

A discipline so strict had its penalties. Young persons drifted away—partly for the reasons cited, partly to have their fling with the fashions and gaieties of this unregenerate world. Persons unhappy in wedlock went out of meeting—the Quaker discipline makes no provision for divorce. But no doubt the chief reason why Quakerism stopped growing was its refusal to develop a professional ministry. Quakers grew comfortably well off, sometimes even rich, as quiet, industrious men are apt to do minding their own business; they had neither time nor inclination to seek converts. Literally no one in Quakerism had a direct, personal, sink-or-swim interest in extending Quakerism. There was no quick career value in being a Friend. Thus, it came to pass that Quakerism, instead of triumphing in America, as seemed likely in 1725, soon fell far behind the evangelical churches—Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian—which pushed West with the pioneers.

But neither lack of growth nor the Hicksite schism, a liberal movement led by Elias Hicks in the 1820's could stifle the influence of the Friends in the nation and in the world. In both England and America, they pioneered the downfall of the slave trade. The first protest on record against slavery in America was made by Germantown, Pennsylvania, Monthly Meeting in 1688. Quaker conscience and Quaker money pushed the whole Abolition movement from obscurity to triumph. Quakers freed their own slaves long before the Civil War, and were influential operators of the Underground Railroad, by means of which many Southern blacks were rescued from slavery. This illegal activity was frowned on officially but it continued.

Religious liberty, racial equality, woman suffrage, public education, prison reform, proper care for the insane, abolition of imprisonment for debt, establishment of employment agencies, fair play for Indians, Negroes, and the oppressed generally—these, and all other causes that mean less suffering for mankind and more dignity for the human soul, for centuries, have been matters of deep concern to Quakers.

When a Quaker says that he is

Rufus M. Jones

"concerned," it means more than the same word would mean on other lips. It is not a word lightly used in or out of meeting. It means that the speaker, taking counsel of his conscience, intends to go on listening to the still, small voice and following the inner light until his course is unmistakably clear. When concern has given way to conviction, Quakers joyfully enter upon programs of helpfulness which, to an outsider, seem to entail sacrifices. For instance, I have just read a letter from a Quaker who left an important, well-paid position of life tenure in the educational world to organize and direct a cooperative plantation for poor whites in a Southern state. The plight of these distant brothers —I use the word reverently, as he would—so preyed upon the souls of this teacher and his wife that, after months of heart-searching, they could not do otherwise than accept voluntary poverty in order to be of definite service. A note of compulsion runs through this man's letter: "We had to make this trial of the spirit; it was laid upon us."

One difficulty in describing the spirit of Quakerism is that its followers do not always accept common definitions in connection with uncommon causes. In this case, undoubtedly the chief actors would consider it less of a sacrifice to give up an easy existence for a hard one than to go on living in sterile plenty. But here again we may be confused by words; to a Quaker who has been "concerned" and is now "convinced," an easy life would seem hard to the point of impossibility, a hard life inspiring to the point of vibrant testimony.

Even so, your true Quaker is expected to remain humble, even in spiritual elation. It is said that when the present "grand old man" of Quakerism, Rufus Jones, returned from one of his youthful labors in Europe, he arose in meeting and gave powerful, uplifting testimony on the fruits of wisdom gathered and monies required for the larger harvest. Whereupon an old lady in a bonnet, who was supposed to be deaf but could hear anything she wanted to hear, arose to declare: "Jesus said, 'Feed my sheep'; He didn't say a word about feeding giraffes."

The Quakers, you see, require humility after the event, as well as before it.

There are now four different categories of Friends. The Orthodox number more than 90,000, of whom 30,000 live in Indiana. This group is divided into two parts, one of which hires permanent ministers and conducts services not far different from those of the Congregationalists. The Hicksites, who followed the Unitarian teachings of Elias Hicks in the great schism of the 1820's, have about 16,000 members, two-thirds of whom are in the Philadelphia area where they outnumber the Orthodox two to one. The Wilburite branch, the Fundamentalists of Quakerism, have about 3,000 members.

Differences between these divisions tend to decline in intensity as the years pass and Quakers join to serve mankind. Some might interpret this as a sign of grace; others, as evidence of increasing worldliness. Why fret about the niceties of dress discipline when few broad hats and tight bonnets are worn by the birthright Quakers, even at meeting? Why make a point of language differences, when the discipline as to tobacco and liquor is not seriously enforced? Why worry over Scriptural interpretations on minor points when hate and greed are loose in the world with few to care for their victims? A Quaker meeting on Easter Day reveals millinery as gay and dresses as modish as any other Sunday gathering. But these changes are superficial only; silent prayer in Quaker meeting is still a convincing psychic experience, and those who testify are obviously earnest seekers for truth, or serenely

victorious over doubt and turmoil.

What means most to the future of Quakerism, and to the world as well, is the united support which all its various bodies give to the Friends Service Committee. Disunited on minor points of doctrine, the groups unite in supporting this joint agency for the relief of suffering and the advancement of social justice. It is precisely this work, moreover, which has caught the imagination of our times, so that this small handful of Christian folk, somewhat set apart from the rest of us by tradition, habit, and manners, seems quite suddenly to have taken upon itself, with superb courage and zeal, the burden of Christian leadership in these dreary days when richer and more populous sects shrink from decisive action. Instinctive recognition of this leadership draws far larger sums from non-Quaker coffers for Quaker activities than the Quakers themselves are able to provide. After all there are only 130,000 Quakers—one in 15,000 of the earth's population.

ACTUALLY, the Friends Service Committee has been at work since 1917, when American and Canadian Friends joined to salvage what they could of the spiritual values endangered by the World War. The six hundred young Americans they first sent to Europe in Quaker gray, with red and black stars on their sleeves, were a welcome reinforcement for English Friends at work in Europe since 1914. This organization repaired thousands of damaged houses, built hundreds of new cottages, and provided peasants returning from refugee flight with beds, seeds, utensils, poultry. Always "concerned" for domestic life, the Quakers undertook family rehabilitation on a large scale. Herbert Hoover, a birthright Quaker, paced these developments with his Belgian relief administration.

Short of a book full of quiet heroism, unusual vicissitudes of travel and extraordinary maneuverings of helpful staffs striving to bring distraught peoples into social order. the story of the American Quakers in post-war Europe cannot be told adequately. First and last, nine hundred of them spent $25,000,000 without ever asking the recipients if they were German, French, Polish, or Russian, Catholic, Jew, Protestant, or Atheist. They were the first civilian Americans and the first citizens of any Allied power to enter Germany after the Armistice. Transporting food and medicine, their battered trucks ploughed the length of that stricken land into worse-stricken Poland, Russia, and Austria.

Various incidents reveal the mixture of shrewd practicality and spiritual faith that distinguish Quaker efforts in philanthropy. Trusted on both sides of the fortified lines, the Friends were able to hire German prisoners to restore ruined French villages with war materials no longer needed by the French, and then delivered the wages of those German prisoners to their dependents in their homeland. The sums delivered were not the pitifully small sums paid to prisoners under the regulations; but those earned by free men working under normal conditions. I suppose there has never been a stroke of Christian ethics and economic justice equal to this one in its effect upon the prisoners' dependents and their neighbors. After years of deprivation, here was money honestly earned by the absentee and delivered in his name by strangers who came, paid and went away with a cheery word but no moralizing or proselyting.

Another unusual stroke was that of hurrying milch cows into milkless Austria in order that Viennese children might again have milk. Austria never recovered economically after the World War; and Vienna remained a distressful city plagued by both poverty and riot. Consequently, while the American Quakers elsewhere turned their activities over as soon as possible to native agencies, they kept at work in Austria down to the German seizure of 1938.

Chairman Rufus M. Jones, who directed these activities for the American Friends Service Committee, gives this characteristic testimony to the affection aroused among the suffering peoples of the Old World by these and myriad other acts of mercy and thoughtfulness. When a Quakeress died while doing humanitarian work in Poland, Catholic men and women she had been serving asked the village priest to bury her in holy ground. He explained that this was impossible, but buried her as close as possible to the cemetery fence. During the night the fence was bulged over sufficiently to include her grave.

AMERICAN Friends have since rallied to support the Committee in many grave difficulties Europe has undergone since the World War, notably the Russian famine, the German pogroms and the recent Spanish Civil War. In the case of Spain, the Friends, under most difficult circumstances, applied their old rule against taking sides in acute conflicts. Aid was given in equal volume to both the Loyalists and the Nationalists, and after that bitter war ended, the Quaker organization continued its work for Spain on three fronts. It fed, clothed and sheltered many Spanish refugees in Spain, assisted to return to Spain those who were permitted to return, and finally helped other refugees to find haven in Mexico, Cuba and elsewhere.

The spirit behind this unusual mixture of practical service and ideological non-interference is contained in a message given to the heads of the German Gestapo by Dr. Jones and two companions when in November, 1938, shortly after the worst of the anti-Jewish riots, the Quakers sought to reduce the bitter suffering which was even then racking that unhappy land. Said he:

> "We have come to Germany at this present time to see whether there might be any service which American Quakers could render, and to use every opportunity open to us. Those whom we are to meet and with whom we are to consult should clearly understand that we have had close and friendly relations with the German people throughout the entire post-war period. We represent no governments, no international organizations, no parties, no sects, and we have no interest in propaganda in any form. We have always been unhappy over the conditions of the Peace Treaty of Versailles and in spirit opposed to those conditions.
>
> "We came to Germany in the time of the blockade at the close

(Continued on page 62)

Batter Up!

The bat of the slugger is heard in the land as the sport of millions opens another season

RICHARDS VIDMER
Sports Columnist for The New York Herald Tribune

PROFESSIONAL baseball is a business—of course! A business in which millions of dollars are invested.

Any highly organized enterprise that, in the course of five and a half months, attracts 250,000,000 customers in more than 250 cities, towns and hamlets must be a business—a big business. But professional baseball is far from being a cold-blooded, cut-and-dried industry, for the human element packs each season with romance and drama, with triumph and tragedy.

As another season gets under way fame beckons to unknown youngsters; despair lies in ambush for national heroes. Lads from the farms and the fields, the mills and machine shops, the side roads and city streets will rise to prominence in the American scene; old favorites will pass into the simple silence of memory.

Club owners, stockholders, concessionaires, creditors and ticket takers all may give more than casual thought to the number of persons who pass through the turnstiles, to the cash they contribute, the distance they travel by rail and boat and bus, the number of hot dogs they consume, and the number of gallons of pop. How many dozen baseballs are used, how many tons of bats are broken, how much is paid out in salaries—these are mercenary matters, important enough in their way. But the attention of the public will be riveted, not on these things, but on how well the teams are doing, on how individual players are faring in the way of runs, hits and errors.

The eyes of the fans will be on the youngsters coming up to the major leagues for the first time, on the lads who made the grade a year ago, on the veterans whose greatness may be waning.

There is a young fellow named Harold Reese, wearing the Brooklyn uniform for the first time. He will not be twenty-one years old until July and he never played a big league game before this season. Yet the Brooklyn fans turn the spotlight on him; they have heard he may be around shortstop at Ebbets Field for years to come.

—*Wide World Photos*

"Another Star Is Born?"—Will Harold "Pee Wee" Reese, the 20-year-old Brooklyn rookie rocket his way to fame and fortune or fizzle out? This year at Ebbets Field Reese will find that answer.

They may be surprised to find him five feet ten, weighing 160 pounds, for they learned to call him Pee Wee before they ever laid eyes on him. The name was hung on him as a champion—a marble shooting champion—and he never has lived it down. Last year speed on the bases and agility in the field made him a sensation in the American Association. He was a reckless pace-setter for the Louisville Colonels in the post-season games, hitting .312 in the seventeen contests that made up the play-offs and the Little World series, fielding his position without an error and leading Louisville to triumph in the eleventh inning of the final game when he stole second, streaked to third on a short grounder and subsequently scored the winning run.

So Pee Wee Reese comes up to the big show and everyone expects him to stay. Here is a youngster just starting out on a highly promising career. But can he hit big league pitching? Can he run the bases against big league catchers? Will he be jittery afield before big league crowds?

These are some of the questions to be answered in the next few weeks or months. Meanwhile, the man in the bleachers leans forward with eager anxiety every time a ball is hit in Pee Wee's direction, every time he has to pivot a double play, every time he steps up to the plate.

On the same club is Whitlow Wyatt, a veteran of the wars at thirty-one, who has been up and down and up again. He had his first chance in the big time eleven years ago. He was tried and found wanting, tried again and lingered a while. He pitched for Detroit, later for the Chicago White Sox, still later for the Cleveland Indians. But he never fulfilled the promise that seemed to lie dormant in his long right arm; never could win as many as ten games for a major league club. And so he was despaired of.

Then two years ago he set the American Association aflame, winning twenty-three games for Milwaukee. So Brooklyn gave him one more chance. Last season he started off sensationally, winning eight games without a defeat in the first five weeks. Then tragedy overtook him. He injured his knee and was forced out of action.

Now he comes back again, a year older, a year nearer the end of his career and still striving to be the star they thought he would be eleven years ago.

Another youngster with another problem will be playing for the Boston Red Sox. He is a slender lad who wears big round glasses that make him look like a bank clerk. He is a serious lad who reads big books and

—Wide World Photos

Bob "Lefty" Grove, 40-year-old veteran pitcher of the Boston Red Sox, will again attempt to prove that the years rest gently on his shoulders. Last year he won 15 games and lost four in 23 starts to compile the lowest earned-run average in his league. How long will he be able to keep up this percentage of wins?

says little but does a great deal and does it well. And he has a great name —the magic name of DiMaggio. This is the youngest brother of the celebrated Joe DiMaggio, who came off his father's fishing boat that plies the waters of San Francisco Bay and in a few brief summers gained fame and fortune and the highest honors in the business of baseball.

So far Dominic DiMaggio has followed in his big brother's footsteps, starting with the San Francisco Seals in the Pacific Coast League, developing rapidly into a minor league star. But the footsteps become larger and harder to follow from here on. No matter how well young Dominic plays, no matter how well he runs or throws or fields or hits, fans will be comparing him to the incomparable Joe and shaking their heads. Dominic is prepared for that. He may never lead his brother in hitting, may never play on as many winning teams or be chosen as the most valuable player in the league, as Joe has been. But there is room below that in which a young fellow may find riches and renown.

As Dominic DiMaggio, the boy, comes up for his big opportunity, Lefty Grove, the veteran, struggles to survive. And there is another case to stir the heartbeats of the millions who follow the business of baseball. For years Lefty Grove, young and strong and smart, was just about the greatest pitcher in the game. He hurled the Philadelphia Athletics to three championships. He led his league in almost every department of pitching. And then, it seemed, the years caught up with him and the parade went by.

Robert Moses Grove was thirty-four years old when he was sold by Philadelphia to the Red Sox, and that is a most advanced age for a pitcher who has been flinging fireballs for fourteen years. Yet Tom Yawkey, young owner of the Boston Club, was willing to pay $125,000 on the chance that there still was something left in Grove's long left arm. The next year it looked as though Mr. Yawkey had lost his bet; Grove, who had averaged twenty-five victories a year over the seven preceding seasons, won only eight for the Red Sox. But time has brought dividends on the investment. Grove has grown older, but he is still winning and in the last five years has scored more than twice as many victories as defeats. Now, at the age of forty, he starts again. They thought his career was over six years ago. Lefty Grove must laugh when he remembers that.

Like Grove, Carl Hubbell of the Giants, Ted Lyons of the White Sox and Dizzy Dean of the Cubs also will be struggling against the ravages of the years—and sore arms. The modest Hubbell already has served the Giants for twelve seasons and until two years ago was the master moundsman. Then something happened to his arm. He has managed to pitch through the last two campaigns, but only occasionally and without his former effectiveness. Yet now, at thirty-seven, he has shown signs of a return to the royal ranks.

Will he be the King Carl of old this season? Will he again be the Meal Ticket of the Giants? Or is it just *spring again?*

This will be Ted Lyons' eighteenth year with the Chicago White Sox. He never has played for any other professional club, not even in the minor leagues; he came straight from Baylor University to the big show and has stayed there, a star, ever since. But the tall Texan will be forty years old in June and the end of the road cannot be far away.

And Dean, the laughing boy of baseball, after two dismal years with the Cubs, is getting one more chance to display some of his magic. Although he is only twenty-nine, this will be the final test for Dizzy. Either he comes through or he *is* through.

So it goes on every club. There is a youngster with the world ahead of him or a veteran with his best years

(Continued on page 62)

—Wide World Photos

"The First Family of Baseball"—Brothers Vincent (left) of the Cincinnati Reds, Dominic (right) of the Boston Red Sox, whisper encouragement to their better known brother, Joe DiMaggio (center), star New York Yankee player.

THEY SAY
Quotations from the World Press

Hitler Strikes: Views from Many Countries

Extracts from various sources following the German invasion of Scandinavia

VOELKISCHER BEOBACHTER, GERMANY: "Germany's armed forces seek no cheap laurel wreaths in the North. We are not carrying on a war against racially related small peoples with whom we have lived in peace for hundreds of years.

"The German people, however, are ironlike in their determination—and have impressively proved that through the great decision of the Fuehrer of April 9, 1940—to spare the North from the suffering of the criminal British war. The policy of extending the war will be destroyed with death-dealing blows wherever Britain dares stretch out her greedy hands. No one may forget this word again."

HAMBURGER FREMDENBLATT, GERMANY: "It was effected in closest proximity to naval bases of the Western powers, in addition to which it was probably the biggest and perhaps also the most significant troop landing in military history."

ESSENER NATIONAL ZEITUNG, GERMANY: "Other neutrals, particularly those of Europe, reflect more now than previously whether they would be doing the right thing in altering their strict neutrality as demanded by England. Germany has proved again that it still has initiative, strength and force enough to solve problems as, in the interest of a people of 80,000,000 in the middle of Europe, they must be solved."

LONDON DAILY MAIL, ENGLAND: "Once again the world looks aghast at the foul blend of treachery and aggression which is peculiar, not to Nazism alone, but to Germany.

"The last war had poor little Belgium. This war has poor little Denmark. This will be no Czecho-Slovakia or Poland for Hitler. We could not get at him in Poland, but we can get him in Norway.

"He has exposed his flank to the might of Britain and France. This may prove to be his fatal blunder."

ARBEJDARBLADET, NORWAY: "The situation is particularly grave for our country, but in such times we must keep our heads cool.

"Any tendency toward nervousness or panic would only make it worse."

CURENTUL, RUMANIA: "The principle of international right, directly connected with the sovereignty of states and the independence of peoples, has been violated. We mean the principle of neutrality.

"Pretexts totally foreign to this principle have been invoked for the justification of that violent action, and, once again, might has overruled right. We consider neutrality one of the intangible rights which spring from the national sovereignty of nations.

"The instant sovereign rights ceased there would no longer exist any faith, either legal or moral, for the juridical organization of states, and national sovereignty would become a fiction at the discretion of foreign interests upheld by force. The result would be anarchy in the political organization of Europe.

"Rumania will never share such a point of view. Her conviction is that national sovereignty and the independence of peoples are holy rights which belong to free states, large or small, and which must be respected by everybody and, above all, defended with all national resources by every country.

"Firmly determined to continue her policy of peace in the European region of which she forms part and to keep to the strict neutrality which she adopted right from the very beginning of the conflict, Rumania cannot but note with deep regret the new defeat of international right, which forms the very foundation of the relations of civilized people."

AKASAM, TURKEY: "The aggressive capacity of Germany and the inventive impudence that she uses to justify it are limitless."

THE NEW YORK TIMES, UNITED STATES: "Without any more warning than a gangster gives his victim, without a shadow of justification except brute force, another free nation has been murdered in cold blood. The German war machine rumbled across Denmark's frontier and within an hour the tramp of hob-nailed boots was echoing in the streets of Copenhagen. This was not all. Four German warships attempted to force an entrance to Oslo harbor; the first attack was repelled, and Norway declared war on Germany. The German name has been blackened once more with the record of indelible crime.

"Already it is being argued in Berlin that Germany's course is justified by the prior action of the Allies. It will be said that when British warships entered Norwegian waters for the purpose of laying mines along the coast, the Allies in effect invaded the Scandinavian States, and that Germany had no alternative but to follow suit.

"The argument is specious. The Germans themselves long ago took the initiative in this matter. From the first days of last September they made deliberate war on Scandinavian shipping, and in the course of that war they have murdered more than four hundred Norwegian seamen. The Allied policy of planting mines in certain limited and clearly defined areas along the coast of Norway was a technical violation of that country's sovereignty. But it was a humane illegality, and its sole purpose, as a statement of the British government

pointed out, was to aid the Allies "to establish principles which the smaller states of Europe would themselves wish to see prevail and upon which the very existence of those states ultimately depends." Between Allied action undertaken for this purpose and brutal invasion by force of German arms, there is a gap as wide as the difference between night and day.

"The occupation of Denmark extinguishes still another light of civilization and decency on the continent of Europe. The strategic consequences of Germany's new madness are incalculable; but on this morning of disaster, when the democratic peoples of the north confront a long agony, one can only think of the consequences, in blood and destruction, of making Scandinavia a battlefield."

CORREIO DA MANHA, BRAZIL: "As is his habit, the Fuehrer tried to mask his brutal aggression by alleging that he was proceeding in that manner to prevent England from doing likewise. The rapidity with which the debarkations were carried out on the Norwegian coast shows that the invasion was long premeditated."

NACION, CHILE: "Yesterday it was Czecho-Slovakia, Austria and Poland; today it is Denmark and Norway, and tomorrow's nations probably will be the Baltic ones. . . . For Germany there does not exist any other reason than expansion of its frontiers and nothing traditional in international law has been respected.

"America also can be submitted to such slavery . . . by peoples whose arrogance is heightened by victory."

CRONICA, PERU: "American countries must not await the eleventh hour to prepare themselves to defend their neutrality against the danger threatening them."

POPOLO D' ITALIA, ROME: "It was a grave political error on the part of the imperialist democracies to take the initiative in this war of violating the neutrality of the little countries in the name of whom they were supposedly fighting. Germany has a good excuse for her immediate reply, which can also take the legitimate form of protecting Norway and Denmark.

"It is now well known that the British blockade was only a prelude

Talburt, N.Y. World-Telegram

Again!

for the debarkation of Franco-British troops on the Norwegian and Danish coasts, which had been prepared with the aim of carrying the military and economic offensive more directly against German territory and of forcing Germany to come out of her gigantic fortress. Germany has parried the blow with the same arms but with a quicker move. Once again the imperialist democracies have been beaten to an objective of vital importance."

OSSERVATORE ROMANO, VATICAN CITY: "All who have defended the sacred rights of neutral countries against every one and everything can only look with anguish on the sudden and dramatic enlargement of the theatre of war."

Swedish Iron Ore Important for Germany

—Condensed from an article by Rene Sedillot in L'Europe Nouvelle, *Paris*

Sweden, which has been producing iron as far back as the thirteenth century, was for long its only exporter. But at that time, she had only exploited the deposits of central Sweden. Today, more than two-thirds of Swedish iron ore is extracted in the north, far beyond the Polar Circle.

These far northerly mines have two great advantages: the ore lies near the surface of the earth, so that its exploitation is a comparatively simple matter; and the ore found is of an extremely high quality. Its richness and purity make it eminently suitable for the construction of war materials.

But there is one disadvantage: access to the deposits is not an easy matter. A railway, crossing the entire Scandinavian peninsula from southeast to northwest, is used to ship the ore to the port of Lulea, where it is exported. Lulea is situated over 150 miles from the principal iron-producing regions and during half the year (November to April), the port is obstructed by ice. Then it is necessary to send the ore by rail to the port of Oelosund on the Baltic, about 550 miles farther on, before it can be exported.

To avoid this long journey, it is a much more simple and less expensive matter to ship the ore to the other terminus of the railway, the Norwegian port of Narvik. This port is only about 100 miles from the iron regions and is rendered free of ice by the Gulf Stream.

Sweden exports practically all the ore extracted from her soil; one-third via the Baltic, and two-thirds by the North Sea. Sweden stands fourth in the ranks of steel-producing countries (behind the United States, Russia and France). But she is *first* in the list of exporting nations. She exported almost 13,000,000 tons of iron ore in 1938. Of these, 77 per cent went to Germany, the remainder to Great Britain (13 per cent), Belgium, the United States and Holland.

Without Swedish support, Germany would be in dire straits because of her lack of iron ore. German production, however, has greatly increased in recent years; from 7,570,000 tons in 1936 to 11,145,000 tons in 1938. This has been largely due to the intensive exploitation of Austrian ore.

German iron ore consumption is extremely high. Before the war it was approximately 33,000,000 tons per year. The 22,000,000 tons in which she was deficient could only be obtained by means of imports. In 1938 40 per cent of these 22,000,000 imported tons came from Sweden, about 25 per cent from the British Empire, the rest from France and other countries.

The war makes German dependence on Swedish iron even greater. First, German needs have greatly increased: war demands a great utilization of steel, and steel of high quality. The present production of all German territories (including Poland, Austria,

Bohemia and Slovakia) does not exceed 15,000,000 tons at the maximum and German reserves do not exceed 20,000,000 tons. Germany can no longer obtain anything from France, French Africa or Newfoundland.

Luxemburg production cannot be more than a temporary respite to Germany. From the Grand Duchy not more than 2,000,000 tons of ore could be obtained, scarcely a tenth of what would be necessary. Swedish ore, therefore, is the only hope of the Reich.

Death Overtaking the German Middle Class

—Condensed from an article by L. de Jong in De Groene Amsterdammer, *a weekly, of Amsterdam*

In the city of 300,000 inhabitants which is to rise in the Salzgitter district, near the blast furnaces of the Hermann Goering Works, all wholesale and retail trade will be directed from one central office. No independent baker, grocer, tailor, is to be admitted. At the same time, statistics show that the number of artisans has decreased remarkably all over Germany. An order, which was published towards the end of February 1939, empowered the state to close down unprofitable middle class enterprises. The war has further increased this tendency of eliminating the small businessman. It is quite possible that, if the war should last a long time, the German state will erect "central department stores."

What is to become of the hundreds of thousands of artisans and small shopkeepers who brought Hitler to power? Is it to be the bitter irony of history that their independence is to be terminated by the very National Socialism which they regarded as their last means of survival? Did they, who were afraid of becoming proletarians, support a regime which is to make more proletarians than any other system?

One must discriminate between the *old* and the *new* middle classes. The old middle class consists mainly of small businessmen — shopkeepers, shoemakers, plumbers, etc. The new middle class embraces employees and officials, and all those who have found employment owing to the expansion of administrative work in economic life. We cannot speak of the death of *the* middle class, but only of the death of the *old* middle class. The new middle class is not endangered, even in Germany. Indeed, since the advent of National Socialism its social position has been strengthened.

Daily Mirror, London

When he is hungry, he will come out of his hole.

The position of the old middle class was undermined even in "Imperial" Germany, while the new middle class grew in strength and numbers. The World War accentuated this tendency. The importance of administrative work increased; while the scarcity of raw materials and foodstuff narrowed still further the economic basis of the old middle class. The reserves which the old middle class was able to maintain during the war were destroyed during the post-war inflation. Want of political and social cooperation made it impossible for the old middle class to defend itself successfully against the well organized workers and big businessmen. The old middle class became increasingly embittered. It looked for a scapegoat and hurled its full power against unimportant economic institutions which it accused of being the cause of its misery. These "scapegoats" were above all the big department stores and chain stores.

The old middle class offered itself, soul and body, to a political movement which demanded, according to Article 16 of its "irrevocable" program: The creation and maintenance of a healthy middle class, immediate dispossession of the big department stores, which are to be rented out, at a cheap rate, to small businessmen; discrimination in favor of small enterprises in filling orders for states, counties, and communities.

Adolf Hitler became the idol of the small shopkeeper: He was going to smash the department stores. Shoemakers, cabinet makers, plumbers, bakers, they all expected from National Socialism the reconstruction of their honorable, independent existences. He was to protect them from the fate of such proletarians as factory and other workers.

When Hitler on January 30, 1933, became Chancellor, the old middle class thought that the Third Reich was to be *their* Reich. However, *their* Reich is no more.

The old middle class has derived no advantages from National Socialism. Some groups of skilled workers, as well as higher officials, have increased their income during recent years. But out of these increases they have had to pay higher taxes. At first the Nazi state tried to help them by instituting training courses and trade schools. But their income did not rise, and the weaker members of the old middle class quickly became outright proletarians.

When the National Socialists came

to power, some shopkeepers profited from the closing of competing Jewish shops (of 3,700 Jewish shops in Berlin, 700 had been handed over to "Aryans" by August 1938, while 3,000 had been closed). Other shopowners, especially textile and furniture dealers, gained from increased purchases by working class women who during the depression had been unable to buy new clothes or household goods. However, all the money which the hard-working shopkeeper earned above his previous income was taken from him by taxes. In more than 500,000 enterprises standardized bookkeeping was introduced to facilitate the payment of taxes. But this did not ameliorate the position of many small traders.

The department stores, the stumbling block of the small shopowners, did not disappear. Their turnover in 1938 was one third larger than in 1933. Since 1938 it has still further increased. One reason is that, owing to black-outs, employed women are forced to do their shopping in the business districts during lunch hour.

The fate of the independent artisans is even worse than that of the shopowners. Many unemployed skilled workers started their own enterprises during the depression. This led to overcrowding in a number of trades—shoemaking, baking, tailoring, and so forth. Therefore, aside from certain exceptions, no newcomer may open up a shop in these trades. The expenses of these shaky little workshops proved so ruinous that from April 1936 until April 1938 more than 100,000 of the original 1,500,000 gave up the ghost.

However, the great exodus started *after* April 1938. For, only after that time, did the Four Year Plan, and the war preparations in peace time, begin to permeate Germany's entire economic life.

In the labor policies of the National Socialist regime, three distinct periods can be distinguished. The outstanding mark of the first period was the elimination of unemployment. A number of members of the old middle class, and of the new middle class who had become unemployed, were given work at public work projects—with pick and shovel. During the second period, each worker and employee was given the place "to which he was entitled, according to qualification, background, and experience." Thus, the factory worker became a factory worker, the carpenter

Le Temps

"Not in there—I still owe them five francs from the last war."

became a carpenter once more. This idyll did not last long.

For, during the third period, which started with the Four Year Plan in the Fall of 1936, the workers were taken from the places "to which they were entitled, according to qualification, background, and experience." They were employed at projects which were of importance to the regime. The increasing speed of rearmament sharpened the appetite of the German state for workers to be employed by the big enterprises.

As soon as these workers became scarce in the open labor market, they had to be found somewhere else. This led to a procedure which is known in Germany as the "weeding" of the middle class. It must be pointed out that the aim of this procedure is *not* the rehabilitation of overcrowded trades, but exclusively the liberation of workers for the benefit of big enterprises and military projects. Little attention is paid to the question whether these "liberated" bakers, butchers, barbers, tailors, and shoemakers are the right people for factory work and for strenuous physical labor.

Formerly, the economic independence of artisans was praised to high heaven. The present attitude is illustrated by an article by Dr. R. Krausmueller in the *Deutsche Volkswirtschaft:* "We cannot any longer pay attention to protests which are caused by outmoded enterpreneurs' romanticism or by tenaciously clinging to the 'golden liberty.'"

The "weeding" enables the authorities to shut down unprofitable enterprises. But, nothing is done by force. Before a shop is closed, its owner must have found a new place in the economic life of the country. However, it cannot be denied that—as the sometimes unorthodox *Deutsche Volkswirtschaft* expresses it—"artisans are forced into happiness."

It is not known how many formerly independent artisans are at present enjoying this "happiness." However, even before the outbreak of the present war, it was hoped to eliminate by this method one-third of all small enterprises.

So, the question of whether the "old" middle class is to be eliminated by a regime which this very class called into being must be answered in the affirmative.

Hitler's *Mein Kampf*— An Imaginary Epilogue

—*Condensed from* Lecture Pour Tous, *Paris*

The last chapter is missing from *Mein Kampf*, the chapter that will be needed when Germany's defeat is achieved. We have saved Hitler the trouble of writing this by writing it ourselves as we imagine he would do it. We have taken into consideration Hitler's commonly known pride and conceit, his hate of everything which is not German, his cruelty, everything.

"Nun das ist das Ende!" (This is the end!)

Hitler hangs up the telephone receiver and presses a button on his desk. "Let no one disturb me. I have some important work to finish!" says Hitler to the chief of his guards.

Left alone, he paces up and down his study. Realizing the imminence of Germany's defeat, he has hurriedly left his army headquarters and taken refuge in his favorite hideout, Adlerhorst (Eagle's Nest). Not a sound from the outside penetrates this large circular room with the wide windows. Approaching one of them, Hitler remains motionless. A whirlwind of memories passes through his brain. At last he returns to his desk, picks up a pen and writes.

"Mein Kampf. Nachwort!" (My Struggle. Epilogue.)

"It has never occurred to me until now that I would have to add a final chapter to *Mein Kampf*. But did Napoleon ever think of St. Helena? Despite everything, I am the greatest German who has ever lived. Have I not conceived schemes and accomplished deeds whose greatness eclipses those of all the heroes of history?

"I have ignored the so-called 'rights

of the weak,' whose very weakness disqualifies them to have any rights at all. This has been the basic principle of my mission. Obeying my inward voice which echoed the unconscious hopes and wishes of eighty million Germans, I called out to my people: 'Germany awake!' I have been appointed by Providence as mediator between God and the German nation to fulfil the rights of my race, a superior race with a great destiny.

"When I think of the judgment of posterity I know beforehand that calumnies will sully my name, for my history will be written by perfidious Albion, our hereditary enemy, and France who forced the Versailles Treaty on Germany, who claimed that in 1918 Germany was defeated on the battlefield. My history will be written by liars. That is why the pages I am writing are indispensable to the German people, my people. I will disappear with a peaceful mind, knowing that I am leaving you a wonderful book, my book, which will remain the bible of every German.

"I began my great task of liberating my nation from the dictatorship established by international finance. I gathered all the resources of the country and put them at the disposal of the reborn community. I replaced the gossiping regime by a power drawing its strength from the Fuehrer's will and from the people's blind obedience. My aim was to hammer a sword which was to bring glory to our country. Living space is obtained not through diplomats' gossip but by the point of the sword. I decided to burst the chains of Versailles and give to my Reich frontiers capable of ensuring peace. And when I say peace, I mean the everlasting peace which a master race imposes and maintains.

"Who in Europe is worthy of the title of master race? Is it Britain, whose empire must inevitably break up in the near future? Is it bastardized France which from the Congo to the Rhine will soon be inhabited by half-castes? Is it either of these two countries which boast an unclean democracy controlled by Jews? What will be the fate of these countries on the day when there will be 250 million Germans of pure Aryan blood?

"When Poland, backed by the deceitful British, dared to defy me by refusing to surrender to me the Germans who were languishing under her bondage, I taught them a terrible lesson! I annihilated Poland. However, conscious of my unique role in the world and of my power, I tried on several occasions to negotiate peacefully with both France and Britain. I asked for the colonies which had been taken from us at Versailles. But I was wasting my time!

"In the end I was forced to defend the honor of the German people with the sword. . . . If we have lost the struggle, it is not due to the superiority of Britain and France but to the weaknesses and crimes of my collaborators. I should have been able to rely on the devotion, unselfishness and self-sacrifice of my friends, but from the start there were intrigues, squabbles and rivalries. Goebbels, Himmler and Rosenberg detested Goering, and Goering was only just able to put up with them. Also they were out to get rich. The list of the riches accumulated by some of my collaborators is in a secret drawer of my desk. But I took no action: I was willing to tolerate these weaknesses of my servants as long as they were prepared to carry out my instruction.

"As long as they obeyed their Fuehrer blindly, the whisperings of Himmler did not influence me. Those who were eliminated were punished for their criminal and reckless attempts to oppose my will.

"I chose von Ribbentrop because he spoke English and French, had travelled a great deal, had useful connections in every country, and was thoroughly unscrupulous. It was he who guaranteed that the democracies would not fight; it was he who put us in the hands of Stalin and placed us in this terrible isolation, without allies and friends.

"Himmler, the man who was in charge of my security, master of the Gestapo, has he always been a loyal servant? I failed to solve the causes and circumstances of the explosion at Munich in the beer cellar where only a miracle saved my life. That gave me ample food for thought. But what I cannot forgive Himmler is the failure of his activity against all my personal enemies. The enemies within our ranks, discontented monarchists, democrats, communists, and blockheaded generals, steeped in their prejudices, raised their heads and started to sharpen their daggers with which they finally stabbed the German Army in the back.

"At least I know that the Fatherland was not conquered on the battlefield any more than in 1918.

A German view of the Delphic Oracle: "Thou art to advance and defeat a great empire."

"Tomorrow when it is learned what I have just decided to do, then the nations will be confident that the conditions for a lasting peace have at last been established.

"But, will it last?

"Let France rot, let the deceitful British and Russia, mother of treason, know that . . ."

The last words remained unwritten. The final page, at the top of which Hitler's pen had stopped in the middle of a sentence, remained blank. And this empty page will, no doubt, become the symbol of the whole career of the man who thought himself to be the greatest statesman who ever lived.

Dr. Goebbels as Host

—Condensed from an article by Helge Knudsen in Berlingske Tidende, *a daily, of Copenhagen, Denmark*

This was written before the German Nazis brought Denmark under their domination and swept on into Norway.

In the big forest north of Berlin, Dr. Goebbels has become a neighbor of Goering's famous villa "Karin Hall." Their properties adjoin, and the foxes which rove through Dr. Goebbels' property also provide Goering with hunting. Dr. Goebbels does not use a rifle.

Goebbels' villa, "Waldhof am See," lies in a clearing among pine trees, about twenty-five miles north of Berlin. The main building is a big, whitewashed bungalow. The name of the property, formed by iron letters, is spelled out in a half-circle above the principal entrance. A young architect, named Bartels, an able craftsman, built the house—it is a habit of the Third Reich to entrust important tasks to young architects.

Inside, the villa has briefly painted walls, a bright oakwood ceiling and silver chandeliers. The parquet floor, which lies level with the ground, is of several shades of mahogany. The great hall, with its open fireplace, where all congregate, looks toward the garden but has no doors leading into it. If a certain button is pushed, however, giant windows, which reach from the ceiling to the floor, sink down into the ground.

I drove my car over a narrow path through the hilly forest to "Waldhof," where I was to partake of a weekend luncheon. One group of buildings serves as offices. Thus, during the summer months, Dr. Goebbels will be

able to conduct Germany's propaganda from here. There are no farm buildings on the property, only forest; altogether about 1,850 acres.

Some time ago, Hitler paid a visit to "Waldhof." Mrs. Goebbels says that, on that day, he did not mention politics. He had brought toys for the children and passed his time playing with them. That afternoon formed a contrast to the life he has led since the outbreak of the present war.

Women, films, music and the drama have been banished from the Chancellery, where Hitler concentrates all his thoughts upon winning the war. The only feminine guests Hitler has received there since the outbreak of the war were Mrs. Goebbels and the wives of some other Cabinet members whom he once invited to tea. Mrs. Goebbels says that, during her last visit at the Chancellery, she tried to persuade Hitler to see the new film "Mutterliebe" (Mother Love) which she, herself, had seen six times. But she tried in vain.

The Chancellery's menu now consists of one dish, only. Dr. Goebbels has heard Hitler more than once reproach cabinet members and party officials for giving the impression that the meal was not good enough for them.

The menu at the "Waldhof" did not consist of a single dish, but of asparagus soup, venison, and rice a la mode. During the meal, the host talked about his political past. His first newspaper in Berlin was a weekly, which appeared every Sunday. It was cheaper to print it on Saturday, and yet it had to bring the latest news. Therefore, traffic accidents, which were expected to happen on Sunday, were written in advance—of course, the descriptions were given in general terms. One Sunday, an election was to be held in Pomerania. The "Red" parties seemed bound to win, and so the result was written up on the Saturday before. Saturday afternoon, after the paper had gone to press, Dr. Goebbels went to the movies. When, after the performance, he stepped into the street, newspaper dealers already had started to sell the paper. Although the election was to be held the following day, the dealer was already calling out the results. However, Dr. Goebbels' prognosis proved to be correct.

After lunch, Mrs. Goebbels' small daughters, whose long braids were tied with ribbons at the back of their necks, installed themselves at the side of their mother's easy chair. I asked Dr. Goebbels about more pressing problems than reminiscences from the time when the Nazis still belonged to the opposition. Hitler, some time ago, had called 1940 "The Year of Decision," while Dr. Goebbels, himself, had spoken of the "Weeks of Waiting."

Dr. Goebbels explained that no National Socialist ever would think of asking Hitler about the future The Fuehrer talks when he feels like it. It is simply respect for his genius which prevents everybody from asking questions. Sometimes his words come as a surprise. Once, Hitler said suddenly, to Dr. Goebbels' astonishment, that within two months Austria would be German. Hitler was right. Dr. Goebbels is convinced that Hitler even now sees the new Europe plastically before his eyes, with the authoritarian system victorious.

Within two hours Dr. Goebbels is able to rouse Germany to national enthusiasm and fill the streets before the Chancellery with people who want to hear their Fuehrer. After the campaign in Poland, Dr. Goebbels called a halt. Enthusiasm should not be overdone.

Dr. Goebbels compares the neutrals with onlookers during a boxing bout. One too small to take part in the match would retire to the third row. Nobody knows what may happen at the front bench. If somebody should be so audacious as to go near the ropes and encourage one of the contestants, he might receive a punch on the jaw from the other.

The German peace aims have no room for compromise, Dr. Goebbels says. Neither Austria nor Czecho-Slovakia will be given back. There will be no repetition of the Treaty of

(Continued on page 56)

Hitler Invades Scandinavia!

(Continued from page 17)

way refused them after a rather cringing delay, and Sweden turned them down with almost brutal directness. Sweden was not prepared to fight Germany six months ago but she was already arming for any eventuality. Although the Finnish war brought diversity of opinion to Sweden, the division was not along party lines but across them. All shades of political opinion agreed in stepping up Sweden's preparedness program.

Swedish rearmament was not entirely the result of Russia's attack on Finland. The re-creation, in 1935, of a German fleet in the Baltic, preceded a year earlier by the announcement of plans for a huge Red fleet, set the ball rolling. A leading Swedish military periodical, *Ny Militar Tidskrift*, estimated in January 1939 that arms expenditures had been increased 75 per cent in the budgets of the two years just past. By the middle of last year Sweden had spent $200,000,000 on its army and navy over a period of four years. And on January 11, with Russian planes flying over the Swedish boundaries, a record military defense budget *equal* to the total spent since 1935 was voted for the coming fiscal year. An additional $50,000,000 has since been appropriated. Sweden might be able to put an army of nearly 900,000 in the field.

Sweden can furnish its own arms from plants which have been working at full capacity to supply foreign armies. The great Bofors works are the largest in northern Europe and can build anything from a torpedo to a howitzer. They specialize, however, in light field guns and 40 mm. anti-aircraft weapons which can also be used against tanks. The 88 mm. Bofors anti-aircraft cannon did wonders in the hands of the Germans who served Franco in Spain. The Swedish infantry arm is a fine adaptation of the Mauser rifle. The forests of Sweden provide ample raw material for explosives, and with the great iron mines solve the munitions problem. At Boerkborn is located Europe's largest single powder factory.

The lessons of the Polish and Finnish campaigns were not wasted on Sweden, but time did not suffice for the belated attempt to built an adequate air fleet. However, the Riksdag program of 1936, which provided for 260 first line planes, had already been attained and some of the orders placed in this country for bombers and fighters had been delivered when Norway was attacked.

Anti-aircraft defense has largely been left to the civilian authorities, but nonetheless, the larger cities of Sweden are well protected on the ground. Stockholm, population 670,000, would have to evacuate only the sick and aged. The rest could be cared for in tunnels dug into the hard rock on which the city stands. Goeteborg, directly in the path of German bombers, has less favorable natural protection for its 255,000 and must depend upon evacuation to the interior of the country.

The economic life of Sweden is already on a wartime basis, controlled by a law of 1937 which makes the Commission for Economic Defense Preparedness an integral part of the military establishment.

The Swedish navy is small and just now undergoing a building and modernization program. Such strength as it possesses lies in torpedo boats, mine layers, submarines, etc., used in conjunction with the natural and artificial defenses of the 4,600 miles of coastline. These coastal waters are particularly adapted to mine defense.

The most densely populated part of Sweden is protected by a chain of natural and artificial coast defenses which extends from Goeteborg, at the northern end of the Kattegat, by way of Karlskrona and the island of Goltland, to Stockholm and the Aland archipelago. Originally much of the strength of this defense belt depended upon the Norwegian defenses of Oslo, which anchored it at one end, and upon the Finnish fortifications in the island approaches to the main parts of the Aland group. In other words, this line might be turned at either end. Today, Goeteborg would still be one of the cardinal defenses against attack, though the German seizure of Oslo isolated it somewhat.

Stockholm, capital of Sweden, is well defended by geography, and by large fortresses outside the city, armed with heavy defense guns.

Still farther to the north the entrances to the Gulf of Bothnia are covered by a kind of amphibian defense zone, partly island and partly mainland in character. Since the Finnish defeat, the whole of this system lies within immediate striking distance of the Russians at Hangoe.

Can Sweden defend its coasts without a large navy as the first line of defense? In case of attack by Germany, which at this writing is already in a flanking position north of Goeteborg, the answer probably would be in the negative. Such an attack would require the transport of a large mechanized army, but since most of the German tonnage is now held in the Baltic by blockade, transportation would be no real problem. Debarkation would require the support of air and naval forces superior to those of the defenders, and Germany of course has such forces.

What kind of defense would be possible if an attacking force secured a foothold in southern Sweden? A glance at the map will show that this whole part of the peninsula is made to order for the kind of "pincer" operations used so successfully by the Germans in the Polish campaign. The Swedes, therefore, must evacuate the rich and populous provinces in the south and retire to a more easily defended terrain in the lake region. Today, work is being pushed with all possible speed on what the Swedish press has popularized as the King Gustavus Line.

This line consists of a series of artificial fortifications, strategically linked with lakes, rivers and canals, in a sawtooth sequence from Goeteborg to Stockholm. On its western end the line follows the Goeta river to the twin lakes Vener and Vetter. Between these lakes lies the heart of the whole defense zone, the historic fortress of Karlsborg, occupying a position reminiscent of the Manner-

(Continued on page 60)

What's YOUR Opinion?

A monthly department conducted by George V. Denny, Jr., founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air and President of Town Hall, New York

The Question this month:

WHO IS WINNING THE WAR IN EUROPE?

Answers by: REAR ADMIRAL YATES STIRLING, JOHN CALLAN O'LAUGHLIN, NORMAN THOMAS, MAJOR GEORGE FIELDING ELIOT, OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, PAUL C. SMITH, FLETCHER PRATT, MAJOR GENERAL EDWARD J. STACKPOLE, JR., AND OTHERS

OVERHEARD on a street corner: "Well, it looks as if Hitler outsmarted the Allies in Scandinavia."

"Yes, but don't forget, the British lose battles but win wars."

"Yes, I guess the Allies will win all right, but it will be a long, hard fight."

It's strange how these curbstone opinions of the average American parallel the opinions of the military experts.

Americans are certainly the best informed people in the world today, but, paradoxical as it may seem, they are more bewildered and confused than people who are told by their governments just what to believe on all controversial questions.

Ever since Versailles, we have been confused. We didn't know what to make of the peace, and we don't know what to make of the war. Our indignation rose when Japan moved into Manchuria. We were both angry and nauseated by Italy's conquest of Ethiopia and the attendant disclosures of the Hoare-Laval Plan. We were astonished by the ease with which Hitler took over Austria. Our all-night vigils by the side of our radios indicated our interest and concern over the events that led up to Munich.

From our vantage point on the other side of three thousand miles of ocean, we roundly condemned the appeasers when Hitler devoured Czecho-Slovakia piece by piece. We condemned the British for leading Poland into an alliance and then failing to give her military aid in her hour of need. At the beginning of the war last September, while by no means supporting Germany, we were cool to the Allies because of what we considered bungling, selfish and unheroic diplomacy.

During the first eight months of war, in spite of the sinking of the *Athenia* and the other activities of German submarines, the interventionists had not made much headway in America. Opinion is still overwhelmingly for keeping this country out of war. But we are watching, and listening for some letup in the eight months of preparation and strain.

Germany's invasion of Denmark and Scandinavia and the counter attacks of Great Britain have released the tension and this situation is drawing us closer to the European conflict every day. Who is winning the war in Europe is a question deep in the hearts of most Americans, for no matter how isolated we may feel at this moment, we know enough about world conditions today to understand that the outcome will vitally affect our own lives and fortunes.

CURRENT HISTORY sent this query to the country's leading military experts and to several outstanding journalists, authors and editors. We take considerable pride in presenting the studied opinions of the following authorities, who in the interest of an informed America, have sent us their views:

Friedrich E. Auhagen

Director of the American Fellowship Forum; editor of Today's Challenge; *Lecturer; formerly in charge of the department of Germanic languages and literature at Columbia University.*

"Hitler went to war to eliminate Poland as the last obstacle to his avowed aim to create a German-controlled economic and political bloc in Central Europe. This objective was won after three weeks of war. Thereafter Germany had to defend the position of military and economic security she had achieved through the successive absorption of Austria, Czechoslovakia and Western Poland. In this she has succeeded despite all diplomatic, military and economic measures taken against her by England and France.

"The two Allies, on the other hand, went to war to wrest from Germany the fruits of her diplomatic and military victories, and, incidentally, to destroy the regime responsible for them. After eight months of war, England and France have failed to make any progress in this direction. As a matter of fact, now that the Finnish war has been won by Russia, Germany's informal ally, the outlook for an eventual Allied victory appears to be less favorable than at the outset of the conflict.

"Viewed in this light, Germany has been winning the war up to the present. The final outcome will largely depend on Germany's ability to hold out indefinitely against whatever economic and military pressure may be brought to bear against her. If the current efforts of the Allies to 'tighten' the blockade fail to produce any appreciable results, it is

very likely that a peace on the basis of the present status quo may not be far off. And such a peace would be a German victory, even though it might leave virtually intact the territorial possessions of Great Britain and France.

"England's power to manipulate the affairs of the European continent would then be permanently lost. The influence of France would be confined to her own empire, while Germany would henceforth enjoy undisputed control over the central section of Europe.

"Meanwhile, millions of constructive minded people all over the world are longing for a peace that is not merely an armistice, as was the Versailles Treaty, but a system of permanent cooperation freely supported by all nations concerned.

"The termination of the European civil war on the basis of the present status quo is more likely to open the way to a more peaceful world than a renewed destruction and partition of Germany with the inevitable aftermath of new wars and revolutions."

Charles Callan Tansill

Professor of American History at Fordham University; author of America Goes to War.

"From a strictly military point of view, Germany is winning the war. Her *blitzkrieg* in Poland was an impressive illustration of the efficiency of the German war machine, and her successful occupation of all points of strategic importance in Norway is an unmistakable indication that Winston Churchill missed the bus that led to victory and is now lost in a London fog that will not soon lift. With a decisive superiority on the sea, the British navy should have been able to repel all German invasions along the Norwegian coast. The complete failure to check any of the German landing parties is an open confession that England is bankrupt in leadership. The genius of Lord Nelson has not descended upon the voluble First Lord of the British Admiralty, whose frequent verbal broadsides have little resemblance to the thunder that foretold the glorious news from Trafalgar.

"Victory for the Allies is possible only with the military assistance of the United States. There is little doubt that the President would like to fix our frontier along the Rhine, but the old theme song, 'Let Us Make the World Safe for Democracy,' has gone a little sour, and there are few American feet that now wish to march to a macabre cadence that led thousands of doughboys to cold graves in France. When this fact is made clear to the statesmen of France and England it will not be long before they will fashion a term far more opprobrious than 'Uncle Shylock.'"

Fletcher Pratt

Military expert for The New York Post; *author of* Sea Power and To-day's War.

"As I see it, Germany is a clear winner on points; but nobody has yet tried for a knockout punch.

"The events of the week April 7-13 are not exactly the knockout punch, only the beginning of it, the maneuver for position before trying it. But I would say that they put Germany far ahead of the game and within measurable distance of winning the war. Of course, this also is subject to revision without notice; a war of action, which this one has become, consists of alternate moves by the contending parties, like a game of chess. We have yet no indication of what the Allied counter-stroke will be, and it may change everything; but I doubt it."

S. K. Ratcliffe

English journalist; lecturer on international affairs; correspondent for The Spectator, *London.*

"The destiny of Britain and Europe hangs upon what happens now in Scandinavia. No single battle of the modern age could have been for any great power so momentous as this may prove to be, since never before have the present conditions existed. For centuries the fate of empires and conquerors has depended upon sea-power, and in the last war Britain was saved at Jutland. To-day the conflict is between the British navy and the German air fleet aided by the submarine, while the tempo has never before been approached. In this terrific encounter two countries hold the crucial positions, Norway and the Netherlands; and as I write (April 15) the world is holding its breath, and any guess as to the next stage must be futile.

"Nazi Germany is committed to the lightning war. By doctrine and national tradition, as by the military record, that policy is fixed; and it is made all the more certain by two forces such as the world has never before seen in combination—a dictator of unlimited authority and a great nation, organized and disciplined beyond all precedent and hammered into the mood of mass self-sacrifice. The course of the war after Poland was foreseen. There was nothing mysterious about the long winter stalemate. It was inevitable as preparation for the total assault on France and Britain upon which everything in German policy and action, from the pact with Russia to the invasion of Norway, has converged.

"The Allied Governments, of course, were aware of this. Their preparations and reiterated warnings have been based upon no other knowledge or theory, for the Nazi technique of conquest was plainly admitted and resoundingly displayed. The Allies cannot win a short war; Germany cannot win a long one; that was the judgment of a leading English publicist on the fateful September 3rd. It was accepted, almost unanimously, as a central truth by the British people, and the experiences of eight months have confirmed their belief. They refuse, as the French people refuse, to dream of an early finish, for one overpowering reason. Such a finish could mean nothing but Hitler's black peace—the one intolerable ending to a war which every nation in the world had passionately longed to avoid."

Henry C. Wolfe

Well-known foreign correspondent; authority on European affairs; author of The German Octopus *and the forthcoming* The Imperial Soviets.

"The present war has its roots in economic causes. It is the second phase of the conflict which was terminated by an armistice in 1918. The period from 1918 to 1939 was an armed truce during which the old struggle was waged by other methods. The early post-war era gave Europe an opportunity to make the armistice permanent through a solu-

tion of the economic problems which bedeviled all the great powers and most of the smaller nations. But Europe passed up that opportunity. German Fascism was the result, a symptom not only of an ailing Reich, but also of a seriously sick Europe.

"The armament race and the economic lunacy of the attempts to achieve national self-sufficiency lowered Europe's standard of living, piled up colossal debts, produced inflation, dammed up the economic lifeblood of world trade and made a major war inevitable. Last August economic conditions in Europe were bad; today they are far worse. Germany is already bankrupt; if this war goes on for two or three years Britain and France will go over the cliff of bankruptcy.

"I hope that I am wrong, but I fear that in this war the Western world is committing suicide. I am afraid that, even if the Allies win, they will be only one step ahead of the losers. Victor and vanquished will be in a state of economic collapse and will be threatened by social and political chaos and revolution. Only one country would be in a position to take advantage of these conditions, the Soviet Union. *I am afraid that Stalin is winning the war.*"

W. Armin Linn

Graduate of West Point; Major in the Reserve Corps; expert on military affairs; author of False Prophets of Peace.

"The German move into Norway appears more likely the brainchild of Nazi politicians than the mature strategy of the German General Staff. If Hitler is successful there, his war is still far from won, either militarily or economically. On the other hand, if he fails to gain control of Norway the military, economic and political consequences may well be disastrous—except in the remote possibility that the Nazis can gain a quick victory on the Western front.

"Further evidence of the political touch in this latest move of the war is the fact that, in dispatching Nazi troops to Norway, 'a boy was sent to do a man's work.' Had a German army of perhaps half a million entered the Scandinavian peninsula through Sweden, a complete victory in the North might have been expected before the Allies could render any worthwhile opposition. In striking alone at Norway the invading army has been limited to driblets of German troops which must be landed by air or by ships in the face of great Allied naval superiority. With excellent luck such an operation might succeed, but the most likely result will be that the Allies will land more troops than Germany; and then to save her troops in Norway Germany will be forced to invade Sweden with an army several times the size of that originally needed—and even then not be sure of success.

"The result in Norway will depend primarily upon the speed with which the Allies can land troops and build up there a strong expeditionary force. For both Germany and the Allies time is the all important factor."

Rear Admiral Yates Stirling

Chief of Staff of the U. S. Fleet, 1927; Commander of the Yangtze Patrol, China; author of Sea Power.

"Great Britain and France are putting their greatest trust in sea power, and in the slow relentless pressure of naval power to give them, in the end, the victory in the war. German air power, supposedly superior to that of the Allies, so far has been used only against limited objectives, such as naval bases, warships and merchant ships. Only small numbers, not larger than fifty bombing planes, have been employed in any single attack by either side. The bombing effects have been disappointing and not up to expectations. Bombers have flown mostly at altitudes around 20,000 feet, above the effective range of the largest anti-aircraft guns.

"If German air power is used in large mass formations against unlimited objectives, the result might develop into a great victory in the air for one side or the other.

"Will such an air victory, where two masses of airplanes meet in mortal combat, parallel the outcome of the great naval victories: Manila Bay, Santiago, Tsushima, where the victor completely annihilated its enemy?

"If this should happen, victory in the air would give an overwhelming advantage and contribute at once to the defeat of the land forces and also sea forces. Without air power, land power and sea power become impotent.

"The occupation of Denmark and Norway by Germany seems to lend color to the hypothesis that Hitler will count most upon his armies on the western front and his superior air power to give him victory. By his reckless sacrifice of his most valuable warships in Norwegian waters, he appears to have placed little confidence in the value of his own Navy, and has decided that the British Navy now cannot save England from defeat.

"If the Allies fail to drive Germany from Norway, air bases in that country, nearer to England, will be used by Nazi air forces. The invasion of Norway seems to show that the British sea blockade has been more effective than Germany has been willing to acknowledge, and to cripple the Allied naval power therefore is Hitler's main objective, using intensive massed air attacks.

"For the moment it would seem that Germany, in being able to hold the initiative, and force Britain to accept the defensive, is winning. However, no one can count the score and assess the winning hand until the last trick has been taken. Air power may tip the scales by its terrible destruction, but victory can be consolidated only through the actions of land power and sea power.

"Outside of Germany and her partners, the world stands four square behind the Allies in their aim to rid the world of that temperamental obsession of running 'amoke,' a Malay frenzy and used as a weapon of intimidation, now acquired by the leaders of the totalitarian nations for the same purpose, in their design to rule the world."

John Callan O'Laughlin

Publisher of The Army Navy Journal, *former assistant Secretary of State, author of* Imperiled America.

"Germany is stopped on the sea by the Allied fleets, on the west by the garrisons of the Maginot Line. An attempt to destroy the former would result in the annihilation of her fleet; an attempt to pierce the latter would result in frightful loss in lives, which

might have serious internal repercussions. Impotent in those directions, her economic needs primarily, and strategic reasons secondarily, forced her to invade Scandinavia. Those same needs must drive her to operations in the Balkan and other neutral states.

"In the hands of the Allies is the formidable weapon we know as sea power. In spite of the plane and the submarine, it has safeguarded the communications of England and France, and cut those by sea of Germany. It enables them to tap the world for the things their war economy must have; it has confined Germany largely to her own production and that of the lands she seizes. It allows them to strike where they will, be it Scandinavia, through the Black Sea or via Greece; it is forcing Germany to extend her strength. It is promoting the possibilities of friction between Germany and Russia and Germany and Italy, since action which the Reich is compelled to take leads to conflict of interest. The Soviet Union cannot long acquiesce in German control of the mouth of the Baltic, and Italy would quickly become restive at German control of the Danube.

"The march of German troops into Scandinavia has forced the war beyond limits, which, though enormous, had not been uncontrollable. Now we may expect the conflagration to spread. Lack of fuel, only, will cause it to die out. The war thus becomes one of resources. Invasion and occupation of neutral lands, to be sure, are important at this juncture, but they are incidents in the greater tragedy which Europe is facing. In the ultimate it will be sea power that will determine the result of the war, and so long as it remains in Allied hands the end will be inevitable as it has been throughout history."

Major George Fielding Eliot

Military expert; newspaper writer, author of The Ramparts We Watch.

"On the eve of the German invasion of Denmark and Norway, the Germans had attained their major objective—the destruction of Poland as a barrier to their expansion to the East—and were immediately concerned with the endeavors of the Allies to deprive them of the spoils of their victory. Those endeavors had taken the form only of economic warfare—a naval blockade reinforced by pressures of various sorts on the neutral countries surrounding Germany.

"There was increasing reason to believe that this blockade had not been altogether effective. There was very definite reason to believe that it was about to become more so, with an increasing degree of disregard by the Allies of the independent position of the small neutrals.

"Faced with this prospect, the Germans have reacted violently in a military assault upon the neutral nations of the north; an assault which, if successful, will give them not only control over sources of supply of some value, but also strategic positions from which their naval and air forces can further impair the efficacy of the blockade and can even threaten the supply lanes of Great Britain herself. On the other hand, if the German attempt fails, the situation of Germany is worse than before, as she will have lost the supplies of Scandinavia and the Allies will move forward to the entrance of the Baltic. It is, therefore, a very heavy stake which the Germans have set upon the board.

"The Allies, and particularly Great Britain, cannot afford to see Germany win control of Norway. It is much too early to form any opinion as to the outcome of this campaign in the North; the issue is still in doubt, time is the all-important factor, and much depends upon the energy with which the Allies act, as well as upon the yet undetermined attitude of other powers—not only Sweden and Russia which may conceivably become involved in the situation, but also all powers capable of creating diversions or difficulties in other theaters. Indeed, it is not yet certain that the Scandinavian move is not in itself a diversion as a preliminary to large-scale operations elsewhere. Beyond these generalities any attempt at prediction at this time in a situation so unclarified would be fruitless."

Views of

MAJOR GENERAL EDWARD J. STACKPOLE, JR.

Military expert; president of the Military Service Publishing Company, Harrisburg, Pa.

"After more than seven months of sparring and shadow-boxing, the heavyweight contenders, Great Britain-France vs. Germany, appear at last to have started boxing in earnest, with the heavy slugging stage possible at any moment. There is insufficient evidence as yet to indicate, even vaguely, that either side is winning. Neither has chalked up a decisive victory of any consequence—economic, naval, military, or aerial.

"Germany has taken the offensive from the very beginning and has won all preliminary bouts, from the day when she reoccupied the demilitarized zone, on through to the most recent occupation of Norway and Denmark. Hitler has out-maneuvered his opponents at will, employing with almost uncanny effectiveness those guiding principles of war which through the centuries have led great captains to victory after victory on the field of battle—principles of initiative, surprise, the offensive, mass and movement. If he continues to demonstrate strategic superiority, he may win.

"As to a forecast, it is anybody's guess as to who *will* win the war. There are many determining factors, such as:

"a. Neutralization of Germany's present aerial supremacy.

"b. Retention by Britain of its centuries-old mastery of the high seas.

"c. Security of the Maginot and Westwall flanks, of which the northern is now being tested.

"d. The success or failure of coming strategic maneuvers by the opposing leaders on land, sea and in the air.

"e. The future weight to be thrown on the scales by active allies which may be acquired by either side.

"f. Utilization of the man-power, wealth and productive capacity of the United States in support of the Allies."

Hanson W. Baldwin

Military expert for The New York Times; *author of* The Caissons Roll.

"This is merely a *personal* opinion. The future course of the war is being, or shortly will be, determined, perhaps not only in Scandinavia, but possibly elsewhere in Europe—the Lowlands, the Western Front, the Balkans. An outright, clear-cut victory by either side—a victory decisive enough to end the war in the near future seems unlikely, though possible. If Germany's invasion of Scandinavia is successful and she is

(Continued on page 58)

Chronology of the European War

MARCH 21—Paul Reynaud forms a Cabinet in France, giving ex-Premier Daladier the war portfolio.
—The *Queen Mary* sails from New York for an undisclosed destination twelve hours after the departure of the *Mauretania.*
—Secretary of State Hull reprimands James H. R. Cromwell, newly appointed American Minister to Canada, for his pro-Ally speech in Toronto.

MARCH 22—The Cabinet of Paul Reynaud survives a test-of-confidence vote in the French Chamber of Deputies by one vote, with 111 deputies abstaining.
—Dr. Karl Clodius, German economic expert, urges Rumania to speed up oil production and improve transportation facilities.
—For the first time in the war, a British submarine sinks a German freighter bound from Norway with a cargo of Swedish iron.
—British officials stop the Italian liner carrying Sumner Welles back to the United States at Gilbraltar and search for Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, German economic expert believed en route to the U.S.
—Washington approves plans to make 2,000 latest type planes, ordered by the U.S. army, available to the Allies.

MARCH 23—Count Paul Teleki, Hungarian Premier, arrives in Rome.
—The Red army occupies the Finnish stronghold of Hangoe, relinquished by the Finns.

MARCH 24—A British submarine sinks a German freighter off the Danish coast.
—Olso charges British violation of Norwegian waters in a strong note to London.
—Viscount Halifax, British Foreign Secretary, indicates that if the Allies win the war they will restore to Finland territory recently taken by Russia.
—Disorders break out in Northern Ireland in defiance of a ban on observance of the 1916 Easter Rebellion.

MARCH 25—British stop-the-war advocates show increasing strength at labor and political rallies.

MARCH 26—France demands recall of Soviet Ambassador Suritz after revelation of his telegram to Stalin hailing the Finnish peace as a defeat of "Anglo-French war mongers."
—Premier Reynaud, in his first radio speech, declares Hitler is menacing the economic independence of the Balkans and France will reply with "war in all domains."
—Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King's Administration is returned to power in Canada, when the voters approve the Dominion's conduct of the war in a general election.

MARCH 27—Anglo-Russian relations are strained when Moscow demands the release of two Soviet vessels laden with tin and antimony, seized by British warships in the Pacific and taken to Hong Kong.
—Norway faces a German demand to prevent Allied violations of her waters or be classed as an accessory to the Allied blockade.

MARCH 28—Under-Secretary of State Welles delivers his report on conversations in Rome, Berlin, Paris and London to President Roosevelt.
—The Anglo-French supreme war council, at its sixth and most important meeting, affirms the intention of the two nations not to make a separate peace.
—All British envoys in Central and Southeastern Europe are instructed to return to London for consultation.
—Forced to refuel at Bermuda, the *Atlantic Clipper*, en route from Europe to the United States, surrenders ninety-four sacks of mail for British censorship.

MARCH 29—Berlin publishes diplomatic documents, allegedly found in Warsaw, quoting Polish diplomats to the effect that Ambassadors Bullitt and Kennedy played parts in bringing about the European war by encouraging the Allies and indicating eventual American intervention.
—President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Hull, Ambassador Bullitt, and the Polish Ambassador to Washington all deny the charges of the German White Book.
—Premier Molotov of Russia charges that the Allies sought to extend the war to the Soviet in order to get at Germany and break the stalemate on the Western Front.

MARCH 30—Berlin hints that other documents found in Warsaw's archives might prove even more sensational than the first White Book.
—Winston Churchill, in a radio speech, serves notice that Britain henceforth will be unlikely to let considerations of neutrality deter her from enforcing the blockade.
—Following brief ceremonies at Japanese-controlled Nanking, former Chinese Premier Wang Ching-wei is proclaimed leader of an "all-China regime."

—U.S. opposition to Japan's "New Order" in Asia is voiced by Secretary Hull in a statement refusing to recognize the Wang regime and reiterating this country's opposition to "armed force as an instrument of national policy."

MARCH 31—German Minister of Agriculture Darre plans conferences with the Ministers of Agriculture of Yugoslavia, Hungary and Italy to insure foodstuffs and oil for Germany despite the stiffening Allied blockade.
—The Supreme Soviet is presented with the largest budget in the history of the Soviet Union with military expenditures setting a new high record.

APRIL 1—The decline of the British pound sterling, in unofficial quotations, worries Washington.
—Representative Hamilton Fish proposes an investigation into the authenticity of Polish documents in the German White Book.
—Germany offers to send 6,000 farm experts to Rumania to speed up production of needed cereals, if Rumania demobilizes 500,000 men to work on crops.

APRIL 2—Prime Minister Chamberlain announces drastic Allied economic warfare through trade pacts limiting exports to Germany by neutrals and through widespread buying to keep materials from the Reich.
—To satisfy demands for exports from Germany, Rumania announces that four million youths will be drafted to work on farms.
—A congressional move to question Ambassador Bullitt on the German White Paper is blocked by Secretary Hull.
—The Swedish government warns that attempts to seize German iron ore ships in Norwegian waters will amount to an invitation to Germany to cut off all Allied trade with Scandinavia.
—The Japanese announce in Shanghai that they will nominate five candidates for the Municipal Council of the International Settlement. This would give them control. The news paralyzes the Shanghai stock market and wealthy Chinese flee into the French Concession.

APRIL 3—In a Cabinet reshuffle, Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, is given added powers.
—In a radio address to the United States Premier Reynaud says, "France and England are strong enough to win the war."
—Field Marshal Goering, in a broadcast to German youth, forecasts "a decisive blow in the West."
—Italy shows concern over the possibility of naval action in the Adriatic.
—The Earl of Athlone, brother of Dowager Queen Mary, is named Governor General of Canada, succeeding Lord Tweedsmuir, who died on February 11.

APRIL 4—Prime Minister Chamberlain asserts that he is "ten times as confident of victory" now as when war broke out, saying that Hitler "missed the bus."

—The British liner *Mauretania*, which slipped out of New York on March 20 and passed through the Panama Canal a week later, arrives in Honolulu to refuel. She is believed en route to Australia and New Zealand to transport troops to the Near East.
—Yugoslavia reveals a British warning that Allied warships will stop Yugoslav vessels carrying bauxite for Germany through the Adriatic to Trieste, Italy.
—The Nazis criticize Under-Secretary Welles as a photo is published showing him talking to Reynaud in front of a map which, Berlin contends, reveals plans of the Allies to carve up Europe at the expense of Germany.

APRIL 5—Britain warns the Soviet against any further attempts against Finland.
—General Sir Edmund Ironside, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, announces that Britain is now fully prepared for any German onslaught.
—The German press, proclaiming "a new phase of the war," warns neutrals that the Nazis are about to strike.

APRIL 6—Norway warns Europe's belligerents that pressure forcing her to contradict her neutrality and favor either side will bring her into war.
—The Socialist party, at a presidential convention in Washington, opposes America's entry into another European war as the nation observes the 23rd anniversary of U.S. entry into the last war.

APRIL 7—The Allies announce the mining of three areas in Norway's territorial waters to cut off Scandinavian ore shipments to Germany.
—Italy and Yugoslavia consider closing the Adriatic to all foreign warships.
—Soviet Russia, apparently in expectation of military developments, shows anxiety to fortify the Siberian-Manchukuan border.

APRIL 8—Two German ships are sunk off the southern coast of Norway.
—Because of British mine-laying in Norwegian waters, Norway protests to both Britain and France, charging "an open breach of international law" and demanding that the mines immediately be removed.
—Rumanian authorities detain British barges carrying dynamite which, the Germans charge, was to be used for blocking a narrow bend in the Danube.
—The Amsterdam correspondent of a Rome newspaper reports that, if the Netherlands become involved in the war, the Dutch East Indies will be placed under the protection of the United States. The story is denied in both The Hague and in Washington.

APRIL 9—In a smashing invasion which startles the world, German troops cross the Danish frontier at 5 A.M. Copenhagen is occupied. The invasion, coming without warning, meets no resistance.
—Dealing another lightning stroke to Scandinavia, the Germans invade Norway, while a naval battle rages off the coast between Allied fleets and Nazi men-o'-war. Norwegians resist the invaders, whose swift attack extends from Oslo in the south to Narvik in the north. The Norwegian government flees to Hamar, north of Oslo.
—German and British planes battle over Oslo.
—Berlin demands that Sweden maintain strict neutrality. The Swedish reply says neutrality is being maintained and reserves Sweden's right to fight if necessary to defend neutrality.
—The German High Command announces that the Nazi air force has dealt "heavy losses" to British and French fleet units off the Norwegian coast.
—Berlin demands that Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria accept German river police along the Danube, following charges that Britain plotted to dynamite the narrow channel to block all shipping to Germany.

APRIL 10—Violent struggles on land, on the sea and in the air rage in and around Norway, whose forces, backed by Britain, battle the Germans. A fierce sea battle is reported at the entrance to the Kattegat, after British warboats force their way through the heavily mined Skagerrak, intercepting a fleet of Nazi transports.
—Berlin announces that Hamar, temporary seat of the Norwegian government, has been occupied, King Haakon and the cabinet withdrawing inland.
—Admitting the loss of two of her crack cruisers—the 10,000-ton *Bluecher*, battered by Norwegian shore batteries and ultimately sunk by a Norse mine, and the 6,000-ton *Karlsruhe*—Germany claims that eleven Allied warships were damaged by Nazi air bombs in the North Sea.
—At Narvik, the Norwegian ore shipping port, the British claim to have sunk six German merchant ships and a German destroyer. They admit the loss of the destroyers *Hunter* and *Hardy*, damage to the destroyers *Hostile* and *Hotspur* and withdrawal of the destroyer *Havoc*.
—Reports received in London that Norway is preparing to negotiate with Germany cause consternation. A pro-Nazi government is announced in Oslo, with Major Vidkun Quisling, former Defense Minister, as Premier.
—Iceland virtually secedes from Denmark, because of the German invasion of the latter country.
—President Roosevelt issues an executive order "freezing" all Danish and Norwegian balances and foreign exchange transactions, to prevent their use by Germany, and extends the war zone, from which U.S. ships are barred, to include the entire coast of Norway.

APRIL 11—Sea and air battles continue to rage off Norway.
—The Battle of the Skagerrak, called a second Jutland by naval experts, apparently is ended with the dispersal of German convoy troops ships. Nazi forces, nevertheless, appear to be landing in Norway in numbers.
—Winston Churchill tells Commons that the British navy has lived up to its traditions, and reports four German cruisers, several destroyers, and U-boats have been destroyed. He also reveals that Britain has occupied the strategically important Danish-ruled Faroe Islands.
—Premier Reynaud calls the Norwegian war a strategical blunder by Germany.

APRIL 12—President Roosevelt remarks that Greenland, a Danish possession, obviously belongs to the American continent.
—Announcing that she is fencing off Germany from contact with Norway by sea, Britain reveals that the waters of the Kattegat, Skagerrak and North Sea are being extensively mined.
—There is fighting in Norway around Oslo and in ports on the west coast.
—Berlin declares that British planes bombed a railway station in Schleswig-Holstein, warning that a repetition may bring wholesale raids on British civilian centers. London denies the bombing.
—Danish shipping, now classed as enemy property, begins to fall prey to the Allies.
—Sweden makes it clear that she will reject expected demands that German troops be allowed passage across Swedish soil into Norway.

APRIL 13—The British Admiralty announces that warships, led by the battleship *Warspite*, forced entry into the fjord leading into Narvik and sank seven Nazi destroyers, opening the way for the landing of troops.
—The Germans insist that the occupation of Norway is proceeding according to schedule.
—King George VI assures King Haakon the Allies are bringing help to the Norwegian defenders.
—President Roosevelt condemns the invasion of Denmark and Norway as "an unlawful exercise of force."

APRIL 14—The British Admiralty announces the torpedoing, but not the sinking, of the German pocket battleship *Admiral Scheer*.
—The newspaper *Nichi Nichi* of Tokyo declares that if either European belligerents or the United States take military action in regard to Dutch East India, Japan will reserve the right to take similar action.

APRIL 15—London announces that British troops have landed at several points along the Norwegian coast.
—President Roosevelt tells the gover-

nors of the Pan-American Union that the American Republics must be prepared "to meet force with force" if they are ever challenged.

APRIL 16—German troops cross Norway's narrow waist by railroad, cutting off the southern section of the country. —Premier Reynaud tells the French Senate that in the first great sea battle around Norway the Allies damaged 30 per cent of the German fleet. —Anti-British demonstrations occur in Italy.

APRIL 17—British fliers bomb the German base at Trondheim, Norway, while warships shell the vital airport at Stavanger for eighty minutes. —The British Minister of Economic Warfare, in a speech at Sheffield, warns Italy that if she wishes to be treated as a neutral, she should behave like one. —In an official statement responding to one issued by the Japanese Foreign Minister on April 15, Secretary of State Hull declares that the status quo of Netherland India must be maintained.

APRIL 18—Great Britain claims to have struck telling blows against Germany in Norway. Report sinking of troop transport, bombing of submarine and downing of two planes as major battle reported imminent in Trondheim. —Nazi army mission visits Italy, but Rome claims no commitments made.

APRIL 19—Norwegian government sources claim Nazis massing for attack against Norwegian and British forces in the Trondheim area.

The Issues in 1940

(*Continued from page* 23)

destroy local self-government, which I believe to be essential if a large nation is to remain democratic. If the people of a community can determine their own affairs, we have real majority rule. If policies are determined in Washington, the people have nothing to say about them, and many crackpot theories have been adopted by the New Deal because they are favored by a very small minority indeed of the total population. Complete government from Washington is bound to become tyrannical. The checks and balances in our Constitution were adopted so that the people's voice could be heard, and not dominated by a single man or group of men.

In my view, the main issue is whether we return to a democratic method of dealing with our problems. They can be solved and they can be solved effectively by the methods which we successfully applied for a hundred and fifty years.

The second issue is the spending policy of the New Deal administration. While trying to regulate everybody else's affairs, it is wholly unable to manage its own. The theory that federal regulation is better than cooperative action looks nice on paper, but is completely disproved by results. Federal administration is not 100 per cent perfect; it is often 100 per cent imperfect. It has not cured the unemployment problem; it has not cured the investment problem; it has not cured the railroad problem. The administration has not put its own house in order. Repeated promises to balance the budget are followed by bigger and better deficits. The reduced deficit promised for the next fiscal year has already disappeared, and we will no doubt add four billion dollars to our public debt next year, as we are doing this year.

It is obvious that this policy can only lead to national bankruptcy, inflation, and the breakdown of our whole economic system, which the New Deal in other fields is working to build up. There is no doubt that, so long as New Deal policies prevail, deficits will continue, and the debt grow to astronomical figures. Every former President, Republican or Democrat, has felt the moral responsibility of holding the government's expenses within its income. A return to that policy, a return to the solution of problems through cooperative effort, with a friendly and not paternalistic government, is the issue of 1940.

They Say—
Dr. Goebbels as Host

(*Continued from page* 48)

Versailles. The question of colonies also will be solved. Among the great post-war problems, according to Dr. Goebbels, the Jewish problem will be the foremost in Europe.

Germany trusts her Fuehrer, says Dr. Goebbels. Just as he has been victorious in Austria, Bohemia, and Poland, he will also be victorious in the future. Not one of the National Socialists would, like a coward, flee abroad, if they should lose. They are not like politicians who are today with the opposition, tomorrow with the government. If they should lose, it would mean their physical end. The possibility of defeat formed only a passing remark during the long weekend conversation at "Waldhof."

Not one telephone rang; not one telegram came. War seemed to be far away from the big, white house in the silent forest. However, it will only be a few more weekends before the owner of "Waldhof" is going to let his propaganda orchestra play fortissimo. Then the radio will play marches for a whole evening as the signal to attack. Then, Hitler's word that 1940 will be the year of decision will come true.

Mrs. Smith Goes to Chicadelphia

(*Continued from page* 32)

were telegraphed to the newspapers. The record was held by the Democratic convention of 1924 when 9,576,000 words were filed by Western Union alone—twenty times as many as in "Gone with the Wind." But Mrs. Smith could not even come close to these "smoke-filled rooms."

At last the preliminary bouts were over. The main battle was at hand—for the nomination for President. By this time Mrs. Smith willingly admitted that she was tired and bored.

By alphabetical right, Alabama had the first chance to nominate, but could pass up its opportunity. Then Arizona would have its turn, but any state could yield to another—as Arizona did at the Republican convention of 1936, when it yielded to Kansas to give Alf Landon's State the honor of putting its Governor into the race. The technique of nominating speeches—which John D. M. Hamilton violated in nominating Landon in 1936—was to pile on the superlatives without naming the candidate until the very end.

Mrs. Smith heard all about the candidate's humble origin, his rise to eminence as a self-made man, his accomplishments and abilities. Then, the mere mention of his name, conventionally, traditionally, produced the grand climax and pandemonium broke loose.

Bands took possession of the aisles. Noise makers appeared from nowhere. Flags and banners mushroomed all over the auditorium. Delegates shouldered state markers and formed a procession winding through the hall. Whistling, yelling, handclapping forced the soundmeter to the top—in the Republican convention in 1936, the ovations for Landon three times hit the noise peak of eighty-five, as compared to the seventy-eight for Hoover, his nearest rival, and clearly demonstrated that Landon was the man of the hour.

Mrs. Smith little by little became aware of the fact that, though the general effect was wild, the individual delegates were calm and professional in their disorder. She glanced at her watch, knowing that any demonstration below fifteen minutes would be an insult to the candidate.

As the ovation appeared to be weakening, the chairman hammered for order, but the cheering redoubled. Gradually the chairman gavelled the convention into quiet. Other speeches followed, seconding the candidate for President, from backers chosen on a basis of race, creed, color, sex and geography rather than their own eloquence—even Jim Farley in his *Behind the Ballots* admitted that at the 1932 Democratic convention he heard "a merciless and unholy flood of oratory." The music boomed on with campaign theme songs—the Landon band and two trios in 1936 belched forth "Oh! Susanna" 1,800 times during the convention. One musician at the 1936 Democratic convention insisted on playing "The Sidewalks of New York" although Al Smith had bolted. But finally quiet was restored. Other candidates were nominated, cheered and seconded.

Then the chairman called the roll. In turn the spokesman for each state announced the vote of his delegation, often after calling a caucus of his members. The caucus gave Mrs. Smith a chance to feel that her opinion was being followed. Some states asked to be polled individually before the entire convention so that some members could show off and make special mention of their own individual choices.

Mrs. Smith caught on to some of the tricks: if no candidate gets a majority on the first ballot, each candidate must show an increase on the next ballot to prove he is gaining strength. She knew that the Republicans in fourteen of their twenty-one conventions had nominated on the first ballot but that the Democrats usually took longer, and that they needed more than one hundred ballots in the all-time marathon in New York City in 1924.

At last one candidate appeared to Mrs. Smith to be forging ahead. A key delegation switched to his side; a favorite son released his votes. The rush to the bandwagon started and swept through the convention hall. Everybody hoped that, since the majority for one candidate had been obtained, the nomination would be made unanimous and thus demonstrate party harmony and conceal the wounds bred by the bitter fight. That was what happened.

The rest was anticlimax. Mrs. Smith took pride in helping to choose the Vice-Presidential candidate—who was acceptable to the Presidential nominee and perhaps had helped swing the tide toward him. She rushed to the railroad station, took the next train home, read in the newspaper that the campaign manager of the Presidential nominee had been elected chairman of the National Committee, and prepared for the real fight in November—the election of the man she had helped nominate for President of the United States.

What's YOUR Opinion?

(Continued from page 53)

able to consolidate her hold on Southern Norway as far north as the railhead at Namsos so as to prevent any hope of the establishment of a northern front, it will mean that the Reich has control of all the resources of Northern Europe and is in a better position to attack England by air and submarine.

"Such a success would seem to make it difficult, if not impossible, for the Allies to win without outside assistance, even though they might be successful in seizing or stopping German imports of Swedish iron ore. At the same time I am not sure that Germany could win by the thrust in the north alone; the war seems more likely to become indefinitely protracted.

"On the other hand, if Allied sea power defeats Germany's air power and does enable the Allies to establish a northern front in Scandinavia, the Reich is threatened from the flank; she will be forced to the economic wastage of large-scale land operations and at the same time subjected to the attrition of the blockade, with the result, I should think, that her eventual defeat would be likely and that the war would be shortened (but *not* to a matter of months)."

Norman Thomas

Socialist candidate for President of the United States.

"I think Germany is in the better position to win in the sense of keeping what she has got. I do not think she is in a good position to beat England and France to their knees.

"In any case, whoever is able to dictate the peace will dictate a bad peace. That is the nature of every dictated treaty and it is peculiarly the nature of imperialist war, such as this is. In no sense will a peace of victory eradicate the economic and political causes of totalitarianism and war. Indeed, the reaction to a peace of exhaustion or a peace which increases chaos in Europe will probably be more totalitarianism and new war.

"Hence I believe that the United States, together with other neutrals, should be on the watch at the earliest practicable moment to mediate, not dictate, in the interest of a negotiated peace.

"If Germany can hold Norway, her military position will, of course, be vastly strengthened. If she fails, it will be vastly weakened. I still question, however, whether even the result of this struggle will enable the victorious side to win a victory comparable to the Allied victory in 1918. I doubt if even America's participation would guarantee such a victory."

Paul C. Smith

Editor of The San Francisco Chronicle.

"Were any 'peace' to be considered today on the basis of the fait accompli, Germany and Russia would be the victors, England and France the vanquished. But there will be no peace even if, as a result of negotiations and diplomatic maneuvers, arms are temporarily laid aside.

"I believe we are facing a long series of armed encounters which will be called 'wars' by our contemporaries, but which will be described by future historians as but physical evidences of perhaps a century of economic, moral, spiritual, intellectual, psychological and philosophic turmoil. If this view be more reasonable than simple pessimism, then I believe that no one will win the so-called war any more than anyone won the first World War twenty odd years ago. That, too, was but a phase, a 'physical evidence' of the 'century' of nihilistic chaos to which I refer. The term 'century' I use to indicate what to me seems like 'a very long time,' rather than merely 'a hundred years.'

"I hope that France and England will 'win' the present 'war'. It seems to me that such a victory is essential if we are to retard the impact upon traditional civilization of all the revolutionary, nihilistic forces which have been unloosed upon us by God-knows-what-or-whom. And perhaps if we can 'retard' this impact we may yet 'evolve' a reconciliation between the underlying forces which could solve the basic problems without first destroying all of our traditional civilization.

"I feel, rather than believe, that from the American point of view the conflict essentially is a struggle between the classical concepts of human freedom and the nihilistic forces

which have been unloosed by the mass-class struggle for mass security."

Oswald Garrison Villard

Former owner and present contributing editor The Nation; *author of* The German Phoenix.

"I was profoundly impressed when I was in England and Germany last fall with the determination of the British to save Europe for decency and justice in international relations and with the tremendous power of the German military machine, with the utter ruthlessness of a criminal government behind it. I know that the British are fighting for their lives.

"Still I have not hauled down the flag, still I believe in the imponderables, still I have faith that men of honesty and cleanliness, men who have ideals, who believe in large degree in the liberties of the mind, the conscience, the spirit, will in the long run conquer infidels and the hordes of darkness—if victory can come out of this war at all. Only one thing seems certain and that is the belief held by every businessman and every official with whom I talked in Germany, Holland and England, whose opinion was worth having—that if this war lasted from two to three years there would be nothing left of European civilization, that every country would be in ruins, and that the sole victors would be Stalin and his Communists, who were so ready to share the loot of Poland with the Nazis."

Arthur T. Robb

Editor of Editor and Publisher Magazine, *oldest publishers and advertising journal in America.*

"It seems to me, from present indications, that Allied seapower is likely to be victorious in the long run, which raises another question—can the Allies wait for the long run? If German occupation of the Scandinavian metal areas, German occupancy of the Scandinavian ports with the complete disruption of this important element in Allied supply, can be maintained, it is quite possible that the Allied war preparations may be fatally impaired.

"That, of course, might lead to 'peace' on German terms, with consequences that I should not care to predict.

"If the Allied forces can be quickly victorious in driving the Germans out of Scandinavia and crippling the German Navy, despite German air superiority, then the outlook is for a speedy end to the German expansion. In that case, the Democracies can be said to have won the war—provided that the peace is a real peace and not another twenty-year armistice."

Pierre de Lanux

French historian; journalist; lecturer.

"The Napoleonic wars were an almost uninterrupted series of French victories—ending with the retreat from Russia, and Waterloo.

"The World War lasted four years, Germany conquering territories in Belgium, France, Russia, Serbia, Rumania, and living off these territories. It ended in a collapse of the German forces on all fronts, the surrender of the German fleet, and the most spectacular defeat of modern times.

"The present war seems to belong to the same class of events.

"Due to our extreme reluctance to declare war, Germany has been able to acquire various territories.

"The question should not be *if*, but *when* and *where* the next Waterloo is to take place.

"If nations and their leaders had better memories, or else more imagination, history would not need to repeat itself so often, and at such cost."

We could not have found a more representative cross section of authoritative opinion at this time than the foregoing. They are the thoughts of trained observers, and they are considered, cautious and intelligent comments on one of the most critical situations this world has ever faced. As citizens of the world's greatest democracy, we may one day soon have to express an opinion that will mean peace or war for the United States of America. What's YOUR opinion now?

Hitler Invades Scandinavia!

(Continued from page 49)

heim line. The whole water line offers fine natural defenses behind which a Scandinavian army could dig in its toes. About fifty miles north of this zone lies the main defensive position of the eastern flank of the Gustavus Line. This is another chain of lakes and rivers terminating in the fortifications around Stockholm.

Fortunately for Sweden, most of her vital war industries are located north of the Gustavus Line; and fortunately, too, her armaments works are, or can be, decentralized so that bombers will be unable to cripple production by a few attacks. If Sweden fights, however, she can only do so as long as Norway and the Allies cover her western flank and pin the German forces fairly close to the Oslo area.

Both Norway and Sweden must rely upon the northern "Gibraltar" which the Swedes built at Boden, the first line of defense against an enemy march around the northern terminus of the Gulf of Bothnia.

Probably Sweden will not voluntarily join the Allied cause, even if Allied armies stand just across the Swedish frontier and bid for aid in the name of democracy and freedom.

If the Allies succeed in cutting all the sea paths along which men and supplies have been moved by Germany into Norwegian ports, and if Allied reinforcements in Norway are important enough to threaten the Nazi forces already on the ground, the German High Command will have only two possible courses of action: forfeiture of the original expeditionary forces and an admission of defeat, or the acquisition of a line of communications through Swedish territory. If the Nazis should decide upon a real infringement of Sweden's independence, a recourse to arms probably could not be prevented by the important Germanophile elements in the Swedish government and armed forces.

Sweden's part in the northern war might well determine the success or failure of the Nazi venture, perhaps even the success or failure of all Germany's plans. But if the Swedes are forced to fight, a number of lesser questions will first be answered before adding up to the final problem—victory or defeat.

A Plan for Europe's Cockpit

(*Continued from page* 20)

domination ever since the power of the Turk in Europe was broken. From the standpoint of Southeastern Europe's prosperity, then, Germany is its natural market. This fact cannot be altered, regardless of the temporary alignments of foreign powers over issues extraneous to the local problem.

It was unfortunate enough for the Southeastern European States that their other great market, Russia, ceased to be a purchaser of services and goods after the Red revolution. The elimination of Germany as a market would indeed reduce these countries to the station of beggars at the Allied doors. Politics is not a charitable occupation, however, and the outside powers will continue to use one Danubian state as a lever against the others, and to "guarantee" one against the other, just so long as the Danubian States themselves invite them to do so by displaying their rifts to the world.

There will be no peace and contentment in Southeastern Europe without a settlement coming from within. If it can be achieved, a lasting premise for peace on the Danube will have been established. If not, new problems will be created. The three most likely possibilities are:

First, Russia may back her claim to Bessarabia by force of arms. Should that happen the Russians would stand within one hundred miles of their Bulgarian kinsmen, in a position to extend Pan-Slav hegemony to the Balkans, dominate the delta of the Danube, and come within striking distance of Constantinople. All that would prevent them would be the Rumanian soldiers, who, we must remember, are not Finns.

Needless to say, the forces opposed to Bolshevik penetration in Southeastern Europe would not stand idly by. Leaning on her ally, Italy, whose interests are equally involved, Hungary would undoubtedly declare that she must protect herself against further Russian expansion by occupying the natural line of defense of her great plains, the virtually impenetrable Transylvanian Alps. This would mean the return to Hungary, not of one-third, but of the whole of Transylvania.

The second eventuality is that Germany, intent on gaining full control of Rumanian economy, may decide that the present method of contractual deliveries does not suit her purpose. Hitler would then probably assign Bessarabia, in northern Rumania to his Soviet "ally," Dobruja in the south to Bulgaria, and Transylvania in the west to Hungary, reserving for himself the oil wells and territory of Rumania proper.

Finally, and most probably, the Allies may order the Near Eastern army of General Weygand to open up a new offensive front on Germany's flank. The German armies would proceed to meet the French and English halfway, possibly on the lower Danube. The Rumanian state would automatically disappear, becoming no more than an extended battleground.

In any of these three cases, Hungary would temporarily or permanently come into possession not only of Maramuresh, Krishina, and the northern Banat, but also of Transylvania. This would merely mean the indefinite prolongation of minority disputes, with Hungary now in the driver's seat.

While the war rages, farsighted men are preparing constructive plans for post-war Europe. It is anticipated that the full-sovereign-nation-state (a purely imaginary concept even today) will completely disappear, giving way to a federation, if not a United States of Europe.

Qualifications for the Presidency

(*Continued from page* 30)

gress the coherence and the responsibility it requires if it is to have that organic unity fit for the needs of the positive state. An "available" President means a weak president; and a weak President means a strong Congress. But a strong Congress does not mean a Congress united in determination of its direction. It means a Congress led in many directions by men whose particular purposes have never been fused into one strong and central purpose. A weak President, in a word, is a gift to the forces of reaction in the United States. It enables them to manipulate and maneuver between every difference that is provoked by the absence of a strong hand at the helm.

Batter Up!

(Continued from page 42)

behind. How far will one go? How long will the other last?

Can Witek and Young of the Giants make the grade? What about Eddie Miller, the Braves' brilliant shortstop whose impressive start was delayed last year by a broken leg? Will Mike McCormick, the rookie from Indianapolis, fill the gap in Cincinnati's left field? Is Boudreau the answer to Cleveland's problem at shortstop? Can Hank Greenberg, one of the game's greatest first basemen, play the outfield at Detroit? Was Benny McCoy, to whom Connie Mack gave $40,000 as a free agent, worth the money?

There is the return of Frankie Frisch to the Pittsburgh Pirates as manager after retiring from baseball for a year. There is the return of Bill Delancy after having been invalided with lung trouble for five seasons. And there is the sheer pride of accomplishment that runs through the ranks of the New York Yankees, who have won four consecutive world's championships and are eager to make it five.

Millions of fans are watching the rise and decline of their favorites with cheers and tears, for in this business there is even more sentiment than cents.

Bata at Belcamp

(Continued from page 36)

tion and consumption in this country.

Bata is a builder of industrial empires, a leader of men, maker of shoes; a man without a country who, at forty-six, clings to a vision that inspired a wistful boy outside a Bohemian inn a half century ago. His collaborators share that vision. They take pride in their work, their homes, and their product. Go to any Bata store and a Bata representative will beam with pleasure if Bata shoes win your admiration.

Day before yesterday, Jan Bata was a youth working with his brother to make a dream come true. Yesterday he was a first citizen and leading industrialist of Czecho-Slovakia, working to fulfil still greater dreams. Tomorrow—you will hear much more of Bata.

Friends at Work

(Continued from page 40)

of the World War, directed the feeding of German children, reaching at the peak no less than a million, two hundred thousand children per day. We were the first to arrive in Vienna after the war, where we brought in eight hundred cows and supplied the children in the hospitals with milk and brought in coal for the fires in the hospitals. After the different revolutions in Austria, we gave relief to the families of those who suffered most in these different collisions, always having permission from the existing government to do so. And at the time of the Anschluss we had secured permission to distribute food to Nazi families.

"In all this work we have kept entirely free of party lines or party spirit. We have not used any propaganda, or aimed to make any converts to our own views. We have simply, quietly, and in a friendly spirit endeavored to make life possible for those who were suffering. We do not ask who is to blame for the trouble which may exist or what has produced the sad situation. Our task is to support and save life and to suffer with those who are suffering.

"We have come now in the same spirit as in the past and we believe that all Germans who remember the past and who are familiar with our ways and methods and spirit will know that we do not come to judge or criticize or to push ourselves in, but to inquire in the most friendly manner whether there is anything we can do to promote life and human welfare and to relieve suffering."

So thoroughly did this committee win the consideration of the German authorities that one of the men of steel solicitously held their coats for the Americans when the latter left after securing the desired permission. The veteran philosopher Dr. Jones blandly states that nothing like that ever happened to him at Washington.

At present, the American Friends Service Committee is at work in France, Poland and Finland, helping all the peoples it can reach, regardless of their position in the war, and finds its opportunities for service limited only by lack of funds and trained workers. The Quakers, unmistakably, have won acceptance as disinterested promoters of good on the most suspicious and warlike of continents.

At home the record of the Friends is less involved with high politics, but reveals the same sources of strength—practicality combined with zeal, benevolence combined with vigor. Many years ago at the request of ex-President Hoover, they undertook to help coal miners, stranded by the decline of their industry, to find new occupations. Entering strike-torn areas in the mountain south, the Quakers have elevated the standards of living for employees and converted sluggish employers to the need of more enlightened labor relations. Penn-Craft, in the coal fields of western Pennsylvania, has been developed as a sample homestead community, a cooperative health service has been developed in Logan, West Virginia, and a program of adult education and community welfare set going in eastern Ohio mining towns. These activities are designed to prove to others what can be done, as the Friends are fully aware that they will never have money enough themselves to right the entire situation. The program was, however, spread last year by two to three hundred student volunteers who spent their summer vacations working with and for the miners in widely scattered areas marked by social and industrial upheaval.

Increasingly a "concern" for refugees has been forced upon the Friends Service Committee. It was natural that cruelly oppressed Germans, both Jews and Christians, should turn for help to those they knew of old; likewise, the Spaniards uprooted by the Civil War in Spain, and the Czechs and Poles ousted from their homelands. In each case, the problem had two aspects—to ease the refugee's present lot and to assist his rehabilitation, which often meant travel to another land with open gates and some sort of welcome marked on the door.

THROUGH the medium of this agency and others, what began as random flight from terror has been organized into some sort of meager decency, with Europe's unwanted people moving toward Palestine, America, Mexico, Cuba, South America. For those who reach America, the Committee has two summer camps of welcome in the Hudson Valley, near Nyack and Kingston, New York, while in West Branch, Iowa, it maintains Scattergood Hostel, once a

Quaker school, where parties of refugees from Germany, each party numbering forty, are initiated into American life before they move on to take part in it on their own. A training school is maintained in Cuba, and a farm colony in Mexico.

Considering the refugee flood likely to be set moving during and after this present European war, who can doubt that what is past is merely preparation for greater trials and more abundant services?

True to their pacific principles, Friends are not content merely to mop up after Mars has wrought his unspeakable evil upon men, women and children, homes, peoples, societies. Continuous teaching of peace goes forward, and no one dares to say of this old and steady peace movement that it is motivated by either propaganda or cowardice. The Committee's Peace Service makes the following services available to colleges —Field Secretary, Speakers, Play and Radio, Moving Picture, Literature, and Peace Volunteer. It also maintains student peace camps, conferences and study groups. Students with $100 to defray their own expenses are now being enrolled for peace volunteer work for nine weeks in the summer of 1940.

How are all these varied and scattered activities financed? Well, among Quakers the Inner Light has never been incompatible with prosperity. Thrift is part of the discipline. Friends manage well their affairs, both public and private. Quaker workers usually pay their own way. Admiration of Quaker methods, recognition that the Friends represent a movement toward human brotherhood rather than a sect, bring a large contribution from outsiders. Friends, too, have their fellow-travelers—members of other religious bodies who accept the main tenets of the Friends, and those who, as the saying goes, "have Quaker blood in them." These friends of the Friends, being many times more numerous than meeting members, contribute generously to Quaker causes.

THE American Friends Service Committee in the pre-war year of 1938 spent a total of nearly $800,000 on all projects, with an administration budget of $83,000. The latter is furnished entirely by the Quakers themselves. If all the goods the Committee distributed were priced in dollars, the sum would be far larger; in point of fact, the Friends Committee has delivered in certain years immense shipments provided by other sources—by the Red Cross, the Grange, the churches, and various semi-governmental agencies. Largest item in 1938 was the Spanish Child Feeding Mission which spent nearly $400,000 in cash for that purpose. Other expenditures were fantastically small considering the accomplishments—*for instance,* only $6,245 was spent by the refugee section.

IN war years, the Friends' budget grows considerably. Expenditures last year were $941,000, divided roughly as follows: General services, $296,710; refugee service, $137,430; relief work, including child feeding, $506,867, part of which represents donations in kind. In its first ten years (1917–27) the American Friends Service Committee received more than $12,000,000 in cash and much more than that amount in foods, seeds, drugs, clothing, and other goods. A report on the Committee's work contains this memorable explanation of those huge gifts:

> "What struck the popular imagination was the impartiality of the work in a world so violently partisan. It gave reality to the Quaker challenge that the alternative to war is not inactivity or cowardice—*It is irresistible and constructive good will.*"

What had started as a venture of faith aroused the widest sympathy. All sorts of people, of all religious faiths or none, gave money and goods to the Friends, even though the Committee's fund-raising activities are extremely modest. To a Quaker, this means that the Inner Light recognized by George Fox nearly three hundred years ago still illumines a channel through which aid flows to human beings caught in bitter want "and the darkness of a new crucifixion." Former President Taft once said of the Quakers that they were 300 years ahead of the rest of society.

Once more an urgent need has descended upon the world; and once more the American Friends Service Committee stands ready to assuage as best it can the sorrows that its counsels to peace could not avert. Quietly the Quakers will now be thanking God for Mrs. Roosevelt; actively the rest of us should be thanking God for the Quakers.

Printed in the U.S.A.

FIFTY TRAVEL BARGAINS

CURRENT HISTORY'S Travel Department takes pleasure in describing briefly fifty travel bargains in the United States, which are being offered today. Minimum rates from New York are quoted and are, of course, subject to change. Send in the coupon below if you desire additional information on any one or more items. 'a' after the price means American plan; 'e' means European plan. This service is offered gratis for the readers of CURRENT HISTORY.

FLORIDA

MIAMI, MIAMI BEACH, CORAL GABLES. In this area are concentrated the most extensive winter recreational facilities in the world Miami, important business center with scores of modern hotels, Miami Beach, across Biscayne Bay, Coral Gables, planned along Spanish lines and Hialeah with its magnificent race-track. Bathing, boating, fishing, golf ....$118. e

KEY WEST. Southernmost city of the United States. A West Indies background, only 90 miles from Havana. Tropical climate tempered by sea-swept breezes (Transportation by rail to Miami only.) .. .$156. a

FT. MYERS. Nearest to the Everglades country Noted as the winter home of Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford. Bathing and golf and fishing Excellent Royal Palms collection. . ... . .$132. a

BOCA GRANDE and USEPPA ISLAND. Fashionable bathing and fishing resort (especially Tarpon.) .. .. $174. a

SARASOTA. Ideal Gulf Coast resort and famous as circus winter quarters. Ringling Brothers Museum of Art here. $144. a

TAMPA. One of the great cities of Florida and an important port Background rich in historical lore yet offering every modern recreational provision . $106. e

ST. PETERSBURG, ST. PETERSBURG BEACH. Perhaps the most popular tourist center in Florida. St Petersburg is almost surrounded by water and abounds in white sand beaches. .. .. .$111. e

TARPON SPRINGS. Best known as the center of the colorful Sponge exchange, this small city has an old world charm of its own. Delightful climate. . . .$134. a

JACKSONVILLE. Florida's largest city, 20 miles from the ocean on St. John's River. .... $92. e

ST. AUGUSTINE. Oldest city in the United States, founded by Ponce De Leon, 1513. All year resort with unusual historical interests. .... $82. e

PALM BEACH. Exclusive and world renowned winter resort center, with its Everglades Club, modern shopping streets, imposing villas and magnificent hotels Every recreational facility .. $139. a

WEST PALM BEACH. Noted as Florida's Year Round Resort situated where the Gulf Stream swings closer to shore than at any other site on the Atlantic Coast. .... $135. a

FORT LAUDERDALE. Unique tropical wonderland with historical setting of Seminole Indian Wars. ....$176. a

HOLLYWOOD-BY-THE-SEA. One of Florida's newest resorts (founded 1921) planned as ideal sports and recreational center. ....$169. a

TALLAHASSEE. Capital of the State since 1823 and for a long time a cultural center of the Old South. A city of unusual charm to the visitor. ....$95. e

WINTER HAVEN. Citrus Capital of the world and the city of one hundred lakes A modern Venice with its many canals. The Florida Cypress Gardens are nearby containing many rare plants .... $132. a

LAKE WALES. Located on the highest lands in the state and conveniently accessible to all parts of Florida. Noted especially for the Bok Singing Tower of 71 bells and the Mountain Lake Sanctuary ....$95. e

SOUTH

NEW ORLEANS. With its mild winter climate is one of America's most picturesque and interesting cities. The old French Quarter is a leading attraction and the Mardi Gras Carnival brings visitors from all parts of the United States. ......$116. e

MOBILE. Alabama's great industrial and resort city on the Gulf. Splendid hotels and bathing facilities through the winter months. "Azalea" season the latter part of March. ....$98. e

BILOXI. One of Mississippi's first settlements, located on the Gulf, and now a fashionable resort. Noted center for shellfish industry Many beautiful parks $117. a

WIGWAM GUEST RANCH. Phoenix, Arizona. On a real cattle range of 17,000 acres 50 miles of desert trails Swimming pool and usual sports attractions. ..$234. a

CROSS TRIANGLE RANCH. Prescott, Arizona. An operating cattle ranch equipped with guest accomodations. Real ranch life with cow-country dances Hunting, swimming . . . $200. a

THE VALLEY RANCH. Valley Ranch, New Mexico. Close to Santa Fe National Forest, an unspoiled wilderness High altitude, fine trout fishing. . .. .. $181. a

SMOKE TREE RANCH. Palm Springs, Cal. A desert ranch in Palm Canyon, with ideal winter climate. Sun-bathing and swimming Schools for children. .$240. a

SUN VALLEY RANCH. Sun Valley, Idaho. More than a guest ranch, Sun Valley combines modern comfort with the atmosphere of the old west. ....$202. e

MID-SOUTH

ATLANTIC CITY (N. J.). Playground of America with its extensive boardwalk, beach, and amusement programs Choice of thirty modern hotels. . ... $44. a

VIRGINIA BEACH (Va.). All year round favorite for lovers of outdoor sport Excellent beach and access to many points of historic interest: Williamsburg, Jamestown, etc Reached by overnight steamer. . .. .$75. a

HOT SPRINGS (Va.). Operated by the Hot Springs Company, which controls 17,000 acres of densely wooded reservation abounding in wild game. ....$97. a

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS (West Va.). Foremost sports and social center of the Alleghenies. Polo, golf, tennis, riding, swimming, fishing Superb natural surroundings. . . ..$76. e

ASHEVILLE (N. C.). Located near the Great Smoky National Park in perhaps the most magnificent scenic area in the United States, east of the Rockies. ..$102. a

PINEHURST (N. C.). Fashionable resort of the long-leaf pine country Excellent for golf, riding, shooting and all outdoor sport. Special all-expense trip feature. ....$108. a

SAVANNAH (Ga.). Offering a real picture of life in the old South and easily accessible by express ship three times a week. Special all-expense plans. .. $76. e

SEA ISLAND BEACH (Ga.). Off the coast of Georgia Offers unexcelled bathing and outdoor sports. Accessible by steamship. ....$123. a

SPAS

FRENCH LICK SPRINGS (Ind.). Noted for its salt springs and baths. Excellent for rest-cures. ....$132. a

HOT SPRINGS (Ark.). More than 70 thermal springs much frequented by invalids. Modern hotels built around springs. 150,000 visitors annually. . ..... $111. e

SARATOGA SPRINGS (N. Y.). Some 160 mineral wells containing calcium, magnesium, iron, potassium, etc. Splendid facilities including Nauheim bath system. ....$57. e

GUAYMAS (Gulf of California). Southern Pacific Railway's new resort development reached overnight from Tucson. Ideal dry climate at sea level. Finest game fishing. Hunting excellent. . .. $230. a

PALM SPRINGS. Popular desert resort offering unusual health and sports facilities Warm in winter and tropical in background Many nearby scenic attractions. ... .$268. a

SAN DIEGO and CORONADO BEACH. San Diego with its world-renowned harbor is one of America's fastest growing resort cities. Opposite on a peninsula is Coronado Beach with its host of social celebrities. ... . $210. e

PEBBLE BEACH. Near Del Monte and famed for its magnificent winter homes. Seaside golf course one of sportiest in the world. .. ..$252. a

LA JOLLA. Beautiful coast resort north of San Diego, with large winter population. All facilities for water and land sports. Excellent climate year round. $242. a

SANTA BARBARA. A perfect Pacific Riviera retreat with a background of mountains Besides usual sports facilities noted for the Spanish Mission founded in 1786. . ...$242. a

DEL MONTE. With a climate that varies less than 10 degrees between summer and winter, 20,000 acres of private grounds including 5 fine golf courses and practically all sports facilities. ....$260. a

HAWAII. Best visited from Los Angeles by boat on a tour of 9 or more days, in the Islands, Honolulu, the chief resort, noted for its Waikiki Beach and surf bathing. Equable climate the year round. (Not including ocean transportation.) ....$129. a

EL PASO (Tex.). Great border city of the southwest and guardian of the Mexico frontier, unusual variety of up-to-date hotels offering conveniences for a long or short visit. Near world's largest caves at Carlsbad. ....$162. e

CARLSBAD (N. Mex.). Over the line from Texas in an altitude of 3,000 feet with dry sunny climate. Near the world-famous Carlsbad Caverns, an eighth wonder of the world. .. .. $171. a

SANTA FE (N. Mex.). Year round tourist and resort center in the heart of the real Indian country. America's oldest capital, it is full of historic interest Exceptionally high altitude. ....$191. a

TUCSON (Ariz.). Sunshine city of America, with altitude of 2,400 feet. Famous for its clear dry healthful atmosphere. .... $187. e

HOT SPRINGS (Ariz.). Noted not only as a winter resort, but abounding in health giving waters. Delightful setting for a winter spa. ....$234. a

---

TRAVEL EDITOR, CURRENT HISTORY, 420 MADISON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Please send me more information about ....

....

NAME ....

ADDRESS ....

MAY 40

DEATH OVER ENGLAND!

Vincent Sheean Styles Bridges Frederic Sondern, Jr. 25

CURRENT HISTORY

PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL

ITALY'S THEATER OF WAR

By Henry C. Wolfe

U. S. AIR SUPREMACY

GERMANY'S

POISON GAS!

THE WAR ON LAND

What's Your Telephone Score?

EVERY DAY many pleasant voices go over the telephone. And it seems to us the number is growing. For most people realize the business and social value of "The Voice with a Smile."

Sometimes what may appear like a gruff or hasty manner is not meant that way at all, but is simply carelessness or thoughtlessness.

Since this is the age of quizzes, how about a short one on some points of telephone usage?

Do You Talk Directly Into the Telephone?

The proper way to use the telephone for best results is to hold the transmitter directly in front of the lips while you are talking.

Do You Speak Pleasantly?

Remember . . . it may be your best friend or best customer. Greet him as pleasantly as if you were face to face. Pleasant people get the most fun out of life anyway.

Do You Hang Up Gently?

Slamming the receiver may seem discourteous to the person to whom you have been talking. You don't mean it, of course, but it may leave the wrong impression.

Do You Talk Naturally?

Your normal tone of voice is best. Whispered words are indistinct. Shouting distorts the voice and may make it gruff and unpleasant.

Do You Answer Promptly?

Most people do. Delay in answering may mean that you miss an important call. The person calling may decide that no one is there and hang up.

"The Voice with a Smile"

can be a real asset. Haven't you often said of some one who has just telephoned — "My, but she has a pleasant voice." Or — "I like to do business with them because they are so nice over the telephone."

It's contagious too. When some one speaks pleasantly to you, it's easy to answer in the same manner.

Many times you form your impression of people—and they judge you — by the sound of a voice over the telephone.

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

THE BELL SYSTEM CORDIALLY INVITES YOU TO VISIT ITS EXHIBITS AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR AND THE GOLDEN GATE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION, SAN FRANCISCO

The World Today in Books

NORMAN COUSINS

From the presses of the same publishing house *(Alfred A. Knopf)* have come two books battling furiously with each other on the subject of America and the war: Raymond Leslie Buell's *Isolated America* ($3.00) and Charles A. Beard's *A Foreign Policy for America* ($1.50). Neither Mr. Buell nor Mr. Beard manages to score a decisive victory, although each has found enough weak spots in the armor of the other to score telling blows. If you read them both, you are likely to come away with more convictions concerning what our foreign policy should *not* be than what it should be.

It is difficult to apply precise labels to the schools of thought in these books, although Mr. Buell would probably call Mr. Beard an isolationist and Mr. Beard would probably call Mr. Buell an internationalist.

Mr. Buell does not identify himself with any specific label, although it is clear from his book that he believes in the Family of Nations idea and in an intelligent consideration of the problems America shares with the rest of the world. Mr. Beard, who dislikes the word "isolationist," identifies himself as a "continentalist." He is against any American attempt to bring order out of Europe's chaos, and minimizes the mutuality of our problems with any foreign nations, and seems to think we can work out our destiny without paying too much attention to the fate of Europe, or for that matter, the outside world.

Your prejudices will help you decide which book contains the sounder advice, but even so, it will be difficult for even the strongest enthusiasts of either side to avoid the doubt, after reading both these books, that there is any one formula we can put into use now or later which can serve us through any and all eventualities. It would, in short, be simple for us to decide upon a fixed foreign policy if the other nations with which we have to deal in one way or another would tell us in advance what they plan to do and then do it.

Mr. Beard is much more open to criticism along these lines than Mr. Buell. His *A Foreign Policy for America* urges, in effect, that we have as little as possible to do with foreign nations. With this no one could possibly disagree if Mr. Beard could offer evidence that other nations will have nothing to do with us. And this is one of the chief points scored by Mr. Buell, who points out with perfect logic that there is no guarantee the war will not come to us, even though we may not go to war. Mr. Beard seems to step around a direct discussion of the possibility of a German victory and its meaning for America, but Mr. Buell finds such an eventuality a strong argument for some sort of realistic attitude toward the entire question of our relations with Europe—not at some hypothetical future date, but today.

A German victory in the war, says Mr. Buell, would mean that sooner or later America would have to meet the Nazi challenge. He is convinced that a Germany which has conquered Great Britain and France will inevitably turn its dynamism in the direction of the Western hemisphere. Like Hermann Rauschning, who reported that Adolf Hitler told him of Nazi ambitions in America *(The Voice of Destruction)*, Raymond Leslie Buell believes that we are by no means immune from German danger, either from within or from without or both.

The inevitable question to be asked of Mr. Buell at this point is whether a Germany which may be exhausted by war and which may be suffering from acquisitive indigestion would be in any position to challenge the United States. Apparently anticipating this question, Mr. Buell says there is little cause for us to take comfort in such reasoning. The Nazi

"Be Careful of the Candle, Son!"

Remember—you older folks—the trip upstairs to bed when you were too small to be trusted with a lamp? The drafts fluttered the candle flame, and there was that horrid black shadow behind the door. And mother, downstairs, always worried about fire.

EDISON'S invention of the electric light dispelled the darkness that shrouded our homes and streets after dark, but we don't have to go back to the days of candles to find welcome changes in our way of living brought about by electricity. Year by year, electricity has brought additional blessings to American homes.

Today more than 24 million homes have electric lights; 14 million housewives enjoy the convenience of electric refrigerators and electric washers. Five out of six homes have radio receivers. And every year the scientists and engineers of General Electric find additional ways for electricity to serve us all—to help create More Goods for More People at Less Cost.

EDISON LIVES AGAIN. The motion pictures "Young Tom Edison" and "Edison The Man" are bringing to life this genius—one of the pioneers of the General Electric organization—who did so much to put electricity to work for all of us. When you see these motion pictures, remember that Edison's work still lives in every home that enjoys electric lights.

G-E research and engineering have saved the public from ten to one hundred dollars for every dollar they have earned for General Electric

threat may not necessarily be pointed at us directly but at vulnerable spots in the Western hemisphere which would involve us just the same. Moreover, he adds, a German victory might be the signal for an attempted seizure of the Philippines by Japan, drawing us into a Far East war and leaving the Atlantic in a relatively undefended position, in which case Germany might be tempted to strike either at Brazil or at Newfoundland.

Mr. Buell, it must be remembered, is the gentleman who predicted the German-Russian rapprochement and the partition of Poland by both giants. (CURRENT HISTORY, May, 1939.) Those who scoff at his fears of German and Japanese designs in the Western hemisphere should take into consideration the fact that few observers of foreign affairs have been able to match him in the consistency with which he has correctly analyzed and even forecast many of the most important developments of the last fifteen years.

In view of the German-Japanese threat, says Mr. Buell, this country is confronted by three choices: (1) to cut itself loose from the Philippines at once; (2) to arm itself to the teeth so as to safeguard both Atlantic and Pacific Oceans against any possible combination; (3) to "make sure the British position in the Atlantic is not destroyed by Germany, and take advantage of its position to press for peace in the Orient." For himself, Mr. Buell rules out the first two points as either unfeasible, impossible, or too costly. He is in favor of the third plan, but is vague on the precise meaning of the term "make sure." Obviously, the clearest way of "making sure" would be by direct intervention on the side of the Allies, but Mr. Buell steps very lightly around any direct suggestion that we jump into the war if it appears that Britain will go under. He goes as far, however, as suggesting intervention without troops, throwing ourselves behind the Allies with all our resources and industrial capabilities.

Mr. Buell's argument, then, falls into three parts. The first is that an Allied victory is imperative for American interests; the second is that we must be ready to insure such a victory, for, failing that, we may have to meet the Nazi threat ourselves in a larger and more potent form; the third is a course of action following the war which will give

June CURRENT HISTORY 1940

Contents

THE WAR IN EUROPE

France at War . . . *Vincent Sheean* 13
Norway: Fortunate Disaster . . . *Basil C. Walker* 15
Sea Power *vs.* Air Power . . . *Colonel John Callan O'Laughlin* 20

GENERAL ARTICLES

Poison Gas: Terror Over Europe . . . *Jack Schuyler* 23
Italy's Theater of War . . . *Henry C. Wolfe* 25
Hitler's Himmler . . . *Frederic Sondern, Jr.* 28
American Eagles in the Air . . . *Don Wharton* 32
What Will America Do About Canada? . . . *John MacCormac* 35
Keynoter Stassen . . . *William H. Kelty* 37
The Third Term . . . *Styles Bridges* 38
Relief for Poland . . . *Major Benjamin T. Anuskewicz* 40

HISTORY IN THE MAKING . . . 6

THEY SAY . . . 46

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? . . . *George V. Denny, Jr.* 42

CHRONOLOGY . . . 56

BOOKS . . . *Norman Cousins* 1

COVER DRAWING BY JOSEPH ALLORO

• • •

Editors: JOHN T. HACKETT, E. TREVOR HILL
Associate Editor: ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE
Advertising Manager: JOHN A. CURTIS
Circulation Manager: FRED ROSEN
Editorial Assistants: ROGER W. STRAUS, JR., LOIS HALL, NATHALIE OSBORN

Current History, Volume LI, No 10, June, 1940 Whole No. 304, Published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation Publication office, 20 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass.; New York office, 366 Madison Ave, New York, N Y E. Trevor Hill, President, John T. Hackett, Vice-President; Anne Roane, Secretary; I. Harvey Williams, Treasurer, John A Curtis, Advertising Manager 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Central and South America and Spain; Canada 50c a year additional; elsewhere $1 25 a year additional Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1939, at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879 Entered in Canada as second-class matter

MEMORANDUM FOR LIBRARIANS:

CURRENT HISTORY indexes are published in the last number of each volume.

Beginning with the present volume, 51, every volume will have twelve numbers and will run from September through August. The complete index for the volume will be in the August issue.

not only ourselves but the entire world a sound, lasting peace.

The ideal situation, as Mr. Buell sees it, is for an early end to the war, with America as the mediating force, provided "there is a possibility that a new order, ensuring both peace and justice, can be created." He thinks that the opportunity for such mediation might come during the next two years. But the prime condition for an American-mediated peace, he says, is that the "principles and personalities of Nazi Germany be destroyed root and branch." It is difficult to imagine Mr. Hitler and his lieutenants willingly turning in their seals of office and it appears as though Mr. Buell is vulnerable on this suggestion, for it is most probable that the only mediation Germany will accept will be one fitting her precise requirements. Short of that, Germany will probably attempt to achieve these requirements herself or be crushed in the attempt. Moreover, as Mr. Buell himself admits, a German victory is not at all possible, especially in view of the successful Norway campaign, which, says the author in a last-minute, post-press note, at the beginning of the book, places Britain and France in a "critical" position.

This leads to another weakness in Mr. Buell's argument. He says that America is confronted with the "choice either of traveling a solitary independent road, ending possibly in dictatorship and war, or of using its vast powers to assist in bringing this war to an end, culminating in a peace based on justice, and some new and realistic form of international organization." The weakness here is that, while it is entirely possible that the "solitary independent road" may lead to war, it is also possible that the second choice may take us to the same destination. The sad truth is that no one—not excluding Mr. Buell or Mr. Beard—knows a formula which is certain to keep us out of war. It should be obvious that events themselves are unfortunately more important than any advance plan we might work out. What happens in Europe may make us change our formula so rapidly and so radically that we may wonder at ourselves for ever having thought that we owned the supposedly fool-proof key to peace.

There is much to be said for Charles A. Beard's "continentalism" but here, too, what would happen to a policy of "continentalism" in event of a crushing Nazi victory? Mr. Beard speaks for many Americans when he says we want no part of Europe, but is he in a position to speak for Mr. Hitler and say that a victorious Nazi Germany will have no part of us? Mr. Beard seems to think that a true "continental" policy would mean that our public officers would refrain from speaking out and condemning foreign powers; he thinks we should return to cool, sober, dignified diplomatic terminology, withholding our wrath. This, implies Mr. Beard, antagonizes foreign powers and their rulers and is a step toward involvement. He adds that the freedom of the people and the press to discuss foreign affairs is accepted as axiomatic, but he apparently does not take into consideration that the opionions of our people and our press are even more annoying to foreign powers and their rulers than the unrestrained opinions of our officials.

Sir Nevile Henderson writes in his recent book, *Failure of a Mission*, that Adolf Hitler was angered more over items in the foreign press than he was over the acts or antics of any foreign official. Thus the point which Mr. Beard hopes to gain through a return to staid diplomacy is nullified many times over through the proper exercise of our popular opinion.

Mr. Beard surveys the field of advocates of various foreign policies for the United States and finds, broadly speaking, that it is divided into three groups: the Imperialists, the Internationalists, and the Continentalists. The Imperialists have as their prophet the late Admiral Mahan who pointed out the path to national glory — through large navies and colonies and overseas trade. The Internationalists (in which category Mr. Beard would place Mr. Buell) seek world peace as the only assurance of American peace. And the Continentalists, who are certain to elect Mr. Beard as their No. 1 spokesman, now that he has with one deft stroke relieved them of the opprobrium of the word "Isolationist," seek "non-intervention in the controversies and wars of Europe and Asia and resistance to the intrusion of European and Asiatic powers, systems, and imperial ambitions into the Western hemisphere."

Amplifying the purposes of "continentalism," Mr. Beard says it means a "recognition of the limited nature of American power to relieve, restore, and maintain life beyond its own sphere of interest and control—a recognition of the hard fact that the United States, either alone or in any coalition, did not possess the power to force peace on Europe and Asia. . ."

This brings us to the essential differences between Mr. Buell and Mr. Beard. Mr. Buell thinks we should lend our offices for peace if the opportunity presents itself; Mr. Beard does not. Mr. Buell thinks there can be no peace for America unless there is peace in the world; Mr. Beard reaches a contrary conclusion. What each hopes for is an America at peace —an enduring, constructive peace. But each believes that the other is marching away from it. In fact, each believes the policies of the other may lead to war.

How to choose? The American layman who has been brought so close to war—through headlines and radio —would like to know. The thunder of war becomes louder and nearer. How, he asks, can we stay out?

If we are honest we will tell him that no one has yet come forward with an answer. We will tell him, if we are honest, that a large part of the answer rests not with us or our leaders but with events. We will tell him that there are two sides to the equation of peace, just as there are two sides to every equation. On one side are our plans and our hopes; on the other side are the unknown quantities of the future. Even if our hopes and plans are not affected in a materialistic way by unfavorable developments on the other side of the equation, they may still be affected *morally* or, to use a better word, perhaps, *psychologically*. And when we deal with human reactions we deal with Bismarckian imponderables for which no rigid formula has ever been devised.

JONATHAN DANIELS, the Southerner who discovered the South just a few years back in a colorful, engaging book, has been discovering again. This time it is New England and the book is: *A Southerner Discovers New England*. (Macmillan, $3.00)

The Daniels approach is neither that of an historian nor sociologist nor travel-writer. Daniels is interested more in people than in places; through people he understands their surroundings. This interest is a reflection of his own personality, which is warm, friendly, colorful. He is a progressive—socially and politically.

In New England, stronghold of the nation's political conservatism, he had ample opportunity to examine at first hand the mechanics of economic doctrines with which he apparently disagreed. And yet he finds that conservatism in New England is little different from conservatism elsewhere: "The rich got because the rich grabbed; pity is more important than profit."

In some respects, Mr. Daniels' book does for New England what the Lynds' two books on Middletown did for the Midwest. Daniels is a keen-eyed traveler and even New Englanders will have to admit that his book discovers many aspects of their communities which they themselves have missed.

Norman Cousins, formerly an associate editor of CURRENT HISTORY, *has joined the staff of* The Saturday Review of Literature. *Mr. Cousins, however, will continue to write* CURRENT HISTORY'S *book reviews.*

World Shaking Days

On April 9 Adolf Hitler's German soldiers in their gray-green uniforms staged two lightning invasoins, bloodlessly conquering diminutive and helpless Denmark and landing in Norway prepared for a full-fledged war.

That day will go down in history as one of a series of days that shook the world, days that may well herald a momentous turning point in the stream of modern history.

For on April 9 the second World War, stalemated since September because the Germans and French were so well entrenched behind the Siegfried and Maginot lines, was projected into the open—on a battlefield in a country that had been desperately trying to stay neutral, as it did in the World War of 1914-18.

April 9

The most amazing part of the Norwegian invasion of April 9 was its suddenness. But it should not have been a surprise. Hitler has been quoted as saying, as far back as 1934, that the day of small states was past; that he would create a northern union of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, whether they liked it or not. The man who reports this remark is Hermann Rauschning, then Hitler's chief party leader in Danzig; Hitler told him, apparently, that the conquest of the northern countries would be "a daring but interesting undertaking, never before attempted in the history of the world."

At any rate, aided by a "fifth column"—secret agents planted within Norway—Hitler struck his terrific blow. His excuse was that Norway had to be "protected" from the British, who had laid mines off the Norwegian coast to prevent German ships from carrying Swedish ore from the northern port of Narvik. He charged that Norway's neutrality was being violated by the British, and soon added the charge that the Allies had been planning to seize Norway but that he had beaten them to the punch.

The first indication that Germany was planning her invasion of Norway came on April 8—when two German ships, troop ships apparently — were sunk off Norway's southern coast. Next day, scores of German armed ships steamed through the Skagerrak and German warships proceeded into Oslo fjord, leading to the capital. Soon German planes were flying over Southern Norway. Armored trucks, thundering tanks, and big guns rolled remorselessly through the land. One city after another fell into German hands.

From Norway Hitler would be able to launch submarine attacks on British shipping. There he would find bases for aerial attacks on England, Scotland, and particularly the British naval base at Scapa Flow. The second World War was on in deadly earnest.

April 17

To Winston Churchill, now British Prime Minister, then First Lord of the Admiralty, Hitler's move into Norway seemed as great a political and strategic blunder as that committed by Napoleon when he invaded Spain. London announced that an Allied expedition would be sent to Norway immediately, to drive the Germans out.

Elements of the British fleet steamed across the North Sea and staged an important battle against German craft off Southern Norway. By April 10 Berlin had admitted the loss of several warships, but claimed that German forces, both on the sea and in the air, had wreaked havoc upon the British navy. Not until April 17 did Germany admit that Allied troops had landed in Norway.

Meanwhile, Britain bent every effort to cut off the German supply of troops and equipment streaming into Norway from newly acquired outposts in Denmark, and one troop ship after another foundered under British guns, bombs and torpedoes. Nevertheless, the German forces in Norway steadily increased. In many cases the Nazis resorted to moving troops by air.

At their peak strength, the Allied forces in Norway apparently numbered 12,000. German forces numbered several times as many, as the Allies were to discover to their cost when land battles in Norway got fairly under way.

May 3

The main Allied effort was an attempt to pinch off the port of Trondheim, half way up Norway's western coast, and there check the German advance to the north toward control of the strategic iron deposits on the Scandinavian peninsula. For two weeks the Allies struggled against a vastly stronger foe and then, on

May 3, leaving supplies and stores behind them, the British and French retreated, took to their transports and steamed away, heavily strafed by pursuing Nazi bombers.

Adolf Hitler, his Norwegian campaign won, addressed a special order of the day to his soldiers, praising "an achievement reflecting the highest honor on the daring of the young German armed forces," and declaring: "You have fulfilled the tremendous task which I, in faith in you and your powers, was forced to set for you. . . . Long live the Great Germany!"

Another tune was chanted in England, where Prime Minister Chamberlain insisted that the retreat was a "successful retirement" and told his dejected countrymen that, although the Northwestern Expeditionary Force had been yanked out of the ports of Namsos and Andalsenes (where the Nazi battleflag was fluttering triumphantly), he was satisfied that "the balance up to the present lies with the Allied forces."

Immediately the British press unlimbered its guns at the Prime Minister. "Chamberlain's capacity for self-delusion is a national danger," declared the *Manchester Guardian.* Lloyd George, Prime Minister in the first World War, called the Chamberlain policy "faulty, feeble and foolish."

"All the foresight and striking power in diplomacy and in strategy are on the side of the Nazis," he said. "All the blunders, the ineptitude, the slackness are on the part of the Allies."

Talburt, New York World-Telegram

Satan's Holiday

May 8

As Hitler pinned medals on his triumphant generals, all England squirmed with apprehension over the course of the government's war policy. Press and public insisted that Chamberlain must go.

Wan and weary, hurt by the stinging barbs of his critics, Prime Minister Chamberlain walked dejectedly into the House of Commons on the afternoon of May 8 to defend his policies. He had hardly begun to speak before the Opposition tore into him. "In the name of God, go!" members shouted. Long before, in a moment of elation, Chamberlain exclaimed that Hitler "had missed the bus." The phrase returned to haunt him. "*You* missed the bus!" the M.P's shouted.

Following a nervous speech that lasted just three minutes under an hour, and in the course of which boos often drowned out his words, Chamberlain left Parliament. Next day he had the verbal support of Winston Churchill, his First Lord of the Admiralty. But Britain was done with the man of Munich, done with half measures, done with appeasement.

Laborites, Liberals, Conservatives agreed in their hearts with Lloyd George: "There is nothing that would contribute more to victory in this war than that he [Chamberlain] should sacrifice his seals of office."

By a margin of eighty-one votes, Prime Minister Chamberlain was saved from an overthrow temporarily, but events were in store that would quickly depose him and install aggressive Winston Churchill as Prime Minister.

May 10

On the tenth of May, with stunning swiftness, the Germans opened their dreaded "total war." Striking just before dawn, they launched a terrifically paced invasion of the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg. Fighting planes, tanks and troops quickly overran little Luxembourg. The destruction of Poland last September, and the invasion of Norway in April, had been more dress rehearsals for what was now to come in the west.

Before the sun was over the horizon, hundreds of Nazi bombing planes were roaring over Holland, Belgium, Northern France, even

Fitzpatrick, St. Louis Post-Dispatch

MY COUNTRY IS ANYONE SINGING OF THEE?

[*This powerful cartoon by one of America's greatest cartoonists appeared in* The St. Louis Post Dispatch *on January 19, 1940.*]

over Britain. Parachute troops by the hundreds floated to earth in the Low Countries to seize military key-points, while over the borders stormed troops in steady streams.

King Leopold of the Belgians, like his father in the last war, directed his troops against the enemy. Queen Wilhemina of the Netherlands, confident that her country could be protected by its systems of dikes and canals, directed "a flaming protest against this unprecedented violation of good faith." At the southern end of the Maginot Line, the Nazis massed along the Swiss border, and Switzerland mobilized her full force of 525,000 fighting men.

A German plan to seize Rotterdam through the use of a "Fifth Column"—spies planted in numbers within the country—and parachute troops failed on the first attempt as the Dutch fought furiously, frustrating Nazi hopes of capturing the whole Holland coast within twelve hours for a possible attack on the British Isles. Within little more than an hour, battle planes of the French Air Corps and the British Royal Air Force were flying east for bombing attacks on the Rhineland and the Ruhr. A British Expeditionary Force hurried to head off the Germans at Liege and the Albert Canal, while the French hurried their Eighth army through West Flanders. But the German assault was gaining momentum every hour.

May 13

On the evening of May 10, Mr. Chamberlain resigned and a war cabinet was formed under Winston Churchill. Lord Halifax retained his post as Foreign Secretary. Chamberlain was given the sinecure of Lord President of the Council. Laborite Major Attlee was made Lord Privy Seal and Laborite Arthur Greenwood Minister Without Portfolio. Other Cabinet appointees included Anthony Eden as War Secretary and Alfred Duff Cooper as Minister of Information (Propaganda).

As news of the fierce German attacks in Belgium and Holland horrified England, Winston Churchill made his first speech to Parliament as Prime Minister. He predicted victory for the Allies but warned that evil days lay immediately ahead. "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat," he said, defining the aim of his government as "victory at all costs," and adding that without victory there would be "no survival for the British Empire."

"Come then," he said in closing, "let us go forward together with our united strength." But by that time Germany's onslaught had developed into a series of violent attacks along a 200 mile front from the Netherlands to the Moselle River, Holland had been cut in two and Queen Wilhemina, Princess Julianna, her consort, Prince Bernhard, and their two children had taken refuge in London.

The next day—May 14th—all but a small part of Holland surrendered to the invading German army "to prevent further bloodshed and annihilation." The German Blitzkrieg was raging with amazing effect.

May 17

Within a week, the force of the German attack had astounded the world. Virtually all of the Netherlands was in German hands. Brussels, capital of Belgium, had fallen —and the Belgian government had been established at Ostend.

German mechanized columns had torn a hole sixty miles wide in the western extension of the Maginot Line. German tanks were raking venomously across the French countryside. German shock units were said to be within sixty miles of Paris, and the main German army within a hundred miles.

French, English, Dutch and Belgians, all had battled valiantly, but there had been no holding the German onrush. At this point, on May 17, General Marie Gamelin issued to the French armies an order recalling Joffre's order of September 6, 1914—"at any price, hold."

Said the Gamelin order:

"The fate of our country and that of our Allies and the destiny of the world depend on the battle now being fought.

"English, Belgian and Polish sol-

diers and foreign volunteers fight at our side.

"The British air force is engaged up to the hilt, like ours.

"Every unit that is unable to advance must accept death rather than abandon that part of the national territory entrusted to it.

"As always in the critical hours of our history, the watchword today is 'Conquer or die.' We must conquer."

May 19

Within two more days the emergency created by the smashing German attack had snatched supreme command from Gamelin himself. General Maxime Weygand, Foch's right-hand man in the First World War, had replaced him as Chief of the General Staff.

General Weygand is seventy-three, small, slight, scrappy. *Weygand, il est moi,* Foch used to say. The naming of the new commander-in-chief was interpreted as heralding a large-scale counter-attack by the Allies.

Meanwhile, with enormous power, the invading Germans drove on, westward through Belgium toward the channel ports—bases for an expected attack on England itself—southward through France toward Paris. An Associated Press dispatch from France on May 19 described the technique of the unceasing German blows:

"French troops must be visualized in hastily built individual trenches, perhaps only a yard deep, or crowded behind stones and hidden in clumps of bushes. Forced into open warfare by the rapidity and unforeseen nature of the German advance, French units had to make preliminary resistance in country they had just begun to fortify.

"Their line of more or less isolated posts was attacked first by dive bombers and then machine-gunned.

"After the planes came the famed Panzer divisions of tanks attacking in line almost side by side. These armored divisions are formed of three hundred to four hundred heavy tanks. They swept over what was left of the French lines, spurting flame a hundred yards ahead and raking the ground with fire from automatic weapons.

"As the tanks rumbled through, they wheeled and struck the neighboring section of the line from the rear.

"Behind the tanks, Nazi light infantry divisions poured into the holes, rushed up in scout cars and armored trucks to take over and organize the ground, while the planes and tanks went on to strike at ever-widening sides of the pocket."

Meanwhile, too, German planes, operating far behind Allied lines, blasted away at railroads, highways, oil supplies and other objectives, though here the Allies, despite admitted inferiority in the air, seemed to be giving the enemy as good as they sent.

On May 19, Winston Churchill, Britain's new Prime Minister, exhorted his dogged people to keep a stiff upper lip, but refused to disguise the gravity of the hour, and warned: "After this battle in France abates its force, there will come the battle for our island, for all that Britain is and all that Britain means."

Mr. Churchill confidently expected that at this point the front in France would become stabilized. "It would be foolish," he said, "to suppose that well-trained, well-equipped armies numbering three or four millions of men can be overcome in the space of a few weeks, or even months, by a swoop or raid of mechanized vehicles, however formidable."

Meanwhile, in the United States . . .

American public opinion in recent weeks has done a backflip. Blitzkrieg was the cause—Blitzkrieg in Norway, in the Netherlands, in Belgium, in France. The United States, isolationist by tradition and choice, saw war rush nearer, saw the possibility that in Europe's conflict America might not be able to pass by on the other side.

In sober statistics the Gallup poll summed up sentiment. Last October the pollers found that 46 per cent of the country believed the United States would enter the war. By the middle of May pollers found the percentage to be fifty-one, and concluded that American thinking had "reached an important turning point."

The roar of Blitzkrieg resounded through our national life. At Washington the government moved to strengthen the national defense, and the country cheered the effort. On the eve of a Presidential campaign, partisanship, so far as defense was concerned, was adjourned, and the coming campaign itself promised to be affected by war danger. Business felt the shock. Old-timers said it was 1916 all over again, a streamlined 1916.

Roosevelt as Prophet

President Roosevelt, working early and late at the White House, might well have said: "I told you so." Events were bearing out his warnings, his fears.

A year ago, when the threat of war began to rise in Europe, the Administration, well advised by its diplomats and intelligence agents across the Atlantic, started to work anxiously to avoid the conflict. Diplomatic notes represented the most obvious action. But behind the scenes the Administration did more. Most especially, it sought repeal of the Neutrality Act's arms embargo, hoping that if Germany knew in advance that the Allies could readily obtain American arms, her leaders might then think twice before embarking upon any great military adventure.

Congress remained unimpressed, and it took the outbreak of war last September to bring revision of the Neutrality Law. The Roosevelt proclamation of a "limited emergency" was attacked in some quarters as an alarmist move. The President's successive speeches on international affairs were labeled "war-mongering." The emphasis on defense, in the annual messages of 1939 and 1940, was attacked as an attempt to turn away from the New Deal's social reforms, to hide some of the Administration's obvious failures or mistakes. But the fact of the matter was that Mr. Roosevelt had not told the country all he knew. That was his chief mistake, perhaps, for the

shock of Blitzkrieg became all the greater.

Throughout the anxious months the President had insisted upon two points:

(1) The United States must be kept out of the war;

(2) The United States must aid the Allies, a bulwark against possible Nazi aggression in the Americas, by every means "short of war."

His policy had two corollaries:

(1) The United States must be ready to defend itself against aggression;

(2) That defense must be regarded as a defense of the Western Hemisphere.

A few weeks ago, defense took American headlines away from all else.

President to Congress

The Capitol in Washington presented a scene of unusual activity on May 16. Secret service men were much in evidence and special police swarmed about the hill. President Roosevelt was scheduled to come before Congress and deliver in person a message on national defense. The visit had been announced at the last minute. In the House of Representatives, where joint sessions of the two bodies of Congress are held, there had been no time to surround the speaker's dias with the palms customary when the President appears.

Long before the President's scheduled arrival, the galleries began to fill for what was certain to be an historic occasion. The British Ambassador appeared in the diplomatic gallery. The Senate filed into the chamber. Several Cabinet members arrived. Outside the Capitol, spectators huddled under umbrellas, waiting for the sleek black cars that would bring the White House party. A spring rain pelted all Washington.

When Mr. Roosevelt entered the chamber where Woodrow Wilson twenty-three years ago asked for a declaration of war against Germany, he received an ovation. He looked serious and tired; he had been putting in late hours on the problems of defense. In a dark blue sack suit, he moved to the reading desk. Microphones carried his words to the Congress and to the nation as he began his half-hour address with the words: "These are ominous days."

The Message

This is what the President said:

These are ominous days—days whose swift and shocking developments force every neutral nation to look to its defenses in the light of new factors. The brutal force of modern offensive war has been loosed in all its horror.

New powers of destruction, incredibly swift and ready, have been developed; and those who wield them are ruthless and daring.

No old defense is so strong that it requires no further strengthening, and no attack is so unlikely or impossible that it may be ignored.

Let us examine, without self-deception, the dangers which confront us. Let us measure our strength and our defense without self-delusion.

The clear fact is that the American people must recast their thinking about national protection.

Motorized armies can now sweep through enemy territories at the rate of 200 miles a day.

Parachute troops are dropped from airplanes in large numbers behind enemy lines. Troops are landed from planes in open fields, on wide highways and at local civil airports.

We have seen the treacherous use of the "fifth column" by which persons supposed to be peaceful visitors were actually a part of an enemy unit of occupation. Lightning attacks, capable of destroying airplane factories and munition works hundreds of miles behind the lines, are part of the new technique of modern war.

Hutton, The Philadelphia Inquirer

New Defenses for the Big Ditch

The element of surprise which has ever been an important tactic in warfare has become the more dangerous because of the amazing speed with which modern equipment can reach and attack the enemy's country.

In recent years the defensive power of our army, navy and marine corps has been very greatly improved.

The navy is stronger today than at any time in the nation's history. Today also a large program of new construction is well under way. Ship for ship, ours are equal to, or better than, the vessels of any foreign power.

And the army likewise. This may not be known but it is a fact. It is today at its greatest peacetime strength. Its equipment in quality and quantity has been greatly increased and improved.

In types of planes we are not behind the other nations of the world. Many of the planes of the belligerent powers are at this moment not of the latest models. But one belligerent power not only has many more planes than all their opponents combined, but also appears to have a weekly production capacity at the moment that is far greater than that of their opponents.

From the point of view of our own defense, therefore, great additional production capacity is our principal air requisite.

For the permanent record I ask the Congress not to take any action which would in any way hamper or delay the delivery of American-made planes to foreign nations which have ordered them or seek to purchase more planes. That, from the point of view of our own national defense, would be extremely shortsighted.

During the past year American production capacity for war planes, including engines, has risen from approximately 6,000 planes a year to more than double that number, due in greater part to the placing of foreign orders here.

Our immediate problem is to superimpose on this production capacity a greatly increasing additional production capacity. I should like to see this nation geared up to the ability to turn out at least 50,000

planes a year. Yes, but I go further. I believe that this nation should plan at this time a program to provide 50,000 military and naval planes.

I ask for an immediate appropriation of $896,000,000, and may I say that I hope there will be speed in giving the appropriations. That sum I would divide approximately as follows:

1. For the army, $546,000,000.
2. For the navy and marine corps, $250,000,000.
3. To the President to provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense, $100,000,000.

In addition to the above sum, I ask for the authorizations for the army, navy and marine corps to make contract obligations in the further sum of $186,000,000.

And to the President an additional authorization to make contract obligations for $100,000,000.

The total of authorization is, therefore, $286,000,000.

Shoemaker, The Chicago Daily News

How Safe is our Safe?

Action

Repeatedly, as Mr. Roosevelt analyzed the dangers confronting the country, as he outlined the defense needs and put forward his program, he was interrupted by cheers and applause. Politics for the moment was indeed adjourned as Congress rallied around the man who, more than any other, stood forth as the nation's leader. Enmity engendered by the New Deal was put aside. Rivalries and ambitions were dropped. Even to radio listeners the drama of the scene was apparent.

Most striking of all points in the Presidential program was the request for an air fleet of 50,000 planes, as many probably as all Europe's belligerents put together, and for an annual plane production of 50,000, at least four times the present plant capacity. The thought of such an air force, demanding as it presumably would 100,000 pilots, not to speak of ground crews, mechanics, air-plant workers and designers, dwarfed in public imagination the presidential request for appropriations of $896,000,000 and authorizations of $286,000,000.

Anti-aircraft guns, anti-tank guns, ht tanks and heavy tanks, armored and motorcycles, semi-auto- rifles—all these as well as material for an expanding nd navy had to be considered. New plane factories and new airfields were on the schedule.

Though more than $7,000,000,000 has been spent on the army and navy since 1934, the new Administration request did not stagger the Congress or the country. The chief reservation was: Is the amount enough? More specifically, did the nation not need a navy greater than its present fleet of 369 ships? (Under construction or planned are 77 additional ships.) And was the 227,000-man regular army big enough, even when increased under the President's proposal to 250,000 men?

Congress got under way immediately with the task of appropriating and authorizing the money needed to carry out the program. The Administration moved with celerity to enlist industrialists behind its program, and there was talk of suspending various New Deal laws that restrict working hours. Such suspension might be necessary if production was to be stepped to a maximum. Labor's cooperation was sought. The great effort on a basis of national unity had not been paralleled since the days of Woodrow Wilson.

Third Term Ahead?

The rainy Inauguration Day of 1937 had hardly passed before American politicians began to ask what Mr. Roosevelt would do when his term ended. It was hard to picture so active a man as only the "squire of Hyde Park," fussing around with tree-planting and gardening. The picture became more difficult to draw when no New Dealer qualified to sustain and expand the Roosevelt reforms could be found. A third term was whispered, then mentioned out loud, then shouted. Europe's war made what had once seemed almost fantasy appear a definite possibility.

The President throughout these months of political questioning has refused direct answer on the third term. His attitude was explained:

(1) Refusal to run would end his present influence with Congress;

(2) Mr. Roosevelt wanted to control the Democratic convention and name his successor, as have many Presidents before him;

(3) He hoped to obtain a third term as a guarantee that the New Deal would be preserved;

(4) He feared the European situa-

tion would be so critical that, whatever his own inclination, it would be impossible for him to take his hand off the nation's tiller.

Europe's Blitzkrieg made the fourth explanation seem the most probable. With no other Democrat, except Secretary of State Hull, so expert on American foreign policy, with few outstanding Republicans so experienced, the President, many surmised, felt that national safety demanded that he remain in the White House, all precedents and traditions to the contrary notwithstanding. How true such interpretation might be, none could be sure, but it had become certain that the President could be renominated if he desired. Reelection might be something else again.

In the Democratic party, despite much anti-New Deal feeling and allegiance to the tradition against a third term, no effective opposition to Mr. Roosevelt's 1940 nomination ever got under way. Security Administrator McNutt threw his hat into the ring—with the proviso that he wanted to run only if the President didn't. Senator Wheeler was represented as a possible candidate. So were several others. But none of them did much about it. Only Vice-President Garner made any real campaign, and even he left the business to his managers.

The spring primaries made the Garner candidacy melt away like snow in the spring sun. The Garner forces could corral few delegates. By mid-May the Vice-President was prophesying the Roosevelt nomination, a prophecy that was not too risky, since the President was sure to control a majority of the Democratic Convention's 1,094 votes.

In the Shadow of War

The Willkie group expects no first ballot nomination and they place their hope in the failure of any other candidate to win on the first ballot. The Dewey candidacy, like the candidacies of Taft and Vandenberg, has not won any great number of pledged delegates, although the unpledged delegates, a majority of the convention, contain many likely to vote for one man or another among the three leaders. All the candidates, at any rate, professed confidence.

The war made all the contenders re-examine their campaign arguments. Mr. Willkie openly mentioned his approval of the Roosevelt Administration's foreign policy. Mr. Dewey had seemed to be isolationist in his speeches in the Mid-West. Senator Vandenberg, often called an isolationist, took a position he called "insulation." Senator Taft, who has attacked some Roosevelt foreign policies, pleaded that domestic issues be the primary issues of the campaign.

Meanwhile, even in the Middle West, traditional hot-bed of isolationism, a belief that the United States must aid the Allies "short of war" swept all before it. Ultimately, it was guessed, the Republican party would adopt foreign policy planks not widely dissimilar to those of the Democratic party. The 1940 campaign promised to be fought, like the campaign of 1916, in the shadow of war, a shadow that now, or then, might keep men's minds from all issues but that of war itself.

War Business

When war came to Europe in 1914, the shock so dislocated normal business that for many weeks the New York Stock Exchange was closed and the country moved into depression. Only months after the Allies and the Central Powers began fighting did a war boom get under way. War loans to the Allies helped to stimulate the boom. Munitions plants worked overtime, and factories whose products contributed but remotely to war felt the stimulant.

When war came to Europe last September, the effect on the security markets and on business was slight. The Stock Exchanges had spurts, then declines, then spurts again. Business in the country as a whole fell off, month after month, and only with spring did some upturn become apparent. Even that was probably unconnected with the war. Nor was any boom in sight.

Lack of Allied buying orders could be attributed to at least two causes: (1) Refusal of the United States to grant credits, since the 1934 Johnson Act forbids loans to foreign powers which are in default on previous debts; (2) Allied husbanding of their American purchasing-power.

The Allied Purchasing Board, to be sure, had ordered $1,000,000,000 worth of war material, including 4,000 planes, and foreign exports as a whole were 33 per cent higher in the first six months of the war than in the corresponding 1938-39 period. But none of this was likely to cause any great boom unless buying was tremendously expanded.

Both to aid business and to aid the Allies talk of repealing the Johnson Act was heard, a move quickly denounced by the act's author, Senator Hiram Johnson, California isolationist. But there was the possibility that some way around the law might be found, that planes, if nothing more, would be rushed to the Allies.

The defense program of the United States itself promised an impetus to business. Some Federal economists prophesied that by mid-summer a boom would be under way that the armaments industry would set off the march to full-fledged recovery. That prophecy, however, did not prevent widespread declines in Stock Market quotations after President Roosevelt had addressed Congress.

These declines were part of a general collapse in security and commodity prices. War jitters, fears spread by the German onslaught, the wiping-out of margin men once the decline had started, foreign liquidation—all these factors were cited for the market behavior. Some observers saw deeper.

Cassandra-like, they looked into the future and described the world they foresaw in the event of final German victory. It was a world in which historic capitalism had been altered beyond recognition. Foreign trade, except on a barter basis, was gone, and even that was limited to areas not dominated by Germany. The value of gold was at an end. Some business clung to capitalist traditions, but most had been regimented in the service of a totalitarian state. In such a society profits and dividends would be negligible, and stock ownership would mean nothing.

France at War

Impressions of the life of a country preparing for a struggle to the death with Nazi Germany

VINCENT SHEEAN

By Cable to Current History *from Paris*

FIRST impressions in a country at war ought to be set down quickly, if they are to retain any of the qualities of comparison or perception which relate them to the minds of people at peace. It was so in Spain and China, at any rate; soon the conditions of life there became so normal that it was difficult to realize how far they departed from the state of happier lands. The blackouts and the bombs, however nightmarish, were a pervasive daily and ordinary certainty in Spain, so that one of the main journalistic tasks was to remember to mention them frequently enough to show what the life was like.

In France that stage has not been reached yet. One thinks at first in Paris of a city which has been partially depopulated, but is otherwise pursuing its normal existence. There are many fewer people in the streets, much less traffic, a good many more uniforms. But on that first drive from the railway station, the familiar streets and quays have a sort of Sunday look—no more than that. Evidence of defense preparation is not obtrusive, there are sandbags only at great national monuments, and there are few posters of a warlike character. All the visible signs of war that might have been expected—and were perhaps more striking at the beginning, last September—are reduced to a minimum.

First experience of the regulations cannot be said to startle anybody with war experience, either. There seems to be plenty of food in the restaurants and shops. And meatless days which permit the consumption of excellent fish, eggs and poultry are no great hardship. Rationing even in households—which are always harder hit than the restaurants and hotels—is not severe, we learn from our friends. Prices have gone up a little, but not much. In comparison to Italy, for example, which still counts as a nation at peace, France seems to be better off, more prosperous, and even more cheerful.

This is probably a deceptive impression, for we are not here many hours without hearing of the great sacrifices which have been demanded of the population. Taxes have risen to a staggering height, considerably more even than in England, and the compensation given to the families of the mobilized soldiery is pitiably small. There are thousands of families evacuated from the frontier zones and living now, crowded and poverty-stricken, in Central France. Refugees from Austria, Germany, Spain and other countries greatly increase the burden upon government resources and the total of human suffering. Yet, for those first few hours or days in Paris, it is a little difficult to realize all that. The city smiles in its old familiar way; the chestnut trees are all alight with their cloudy springtime candles; the war is somewhere, somewhere else, but it is not here.

Then, bit by bit, we begin to acquire impressions of another character altogether—of a resolute and almost cheerful foreboding, let us say; of an expectancy which is terrible but has been long discounted. In the center of Paris the shelters against air raids are numerous and seem well constructed. Nothing on this scale came under my observation in Spain, except possibly for the two great modern shelters in the center of Valencia. In line with the thoroughness of the air raid precautions is the nature of the talk we begin to hear. I suspect, and say, that Hitler is too well advised to bomb the cities of the West. He must know what a thrill of horror such action would send through the world, what an effect it would have upon neutral opinion and neutral policy, and how disastrous the reprisals might be. To this my friends here reply that they do not think anything will deter him once he has made the great decision.

This may be so. But in the meantime it all seems a bit remote. I came here after some three weeks of travel and desultory observation in Italy, where the Norwegian campaign was the subject of passionate interest. It was impossible to find a place anywhere, on the street, in a railway carriage, in a café or even a theater, where men were not excitedly discussing the events in the north as if they were taking place on Italy's border. The tone here is much calmer. The difference lies perhaps in the fact that France is at war for better or worse, is steeled to resist a great deal, and cannot regard any defeat as more than temporary. For France the die is cast. In Italy there was a different psychological climate—the climate of a country which feels itself being dragged into a war against all its own instincts, shuddering, reluctant, on the brink.

And since, to a journalist, there are few things more immediately interesting than journalism, it is in the press that I find another specifically French characteristic. It is this: that in spite of wartime rules, censorship, government control and all the rest of it, the newspapers here retain their separate identities and points of view. Within limits they reflect a great difference of opinion; they show it by the emphasis they give various kinds of news, by the language in which they express their opinions, by their style and tem-

perature. *Le Temps* and *Paris-Soir* remain two totally different newspapers, which approach such things as, for example, the fate of Mr. Neville Chamberlain in a totally different spirit.

Coming here fresh from Italy, where each newspaper resembles each other newspaper to such a degree that it is hard to tell them apart, this is particularly apparent. In Italy or any other country ruled by a dictatorship all the main elements of the news are analyzed and decided upon by the central ministry; orders are sent out; and every paper from the Alps to Sicily repeats, parrot-like, what it has been told to say. Here, as might be expected in a wartime democracy, there are a good many things which the censorship does *not* permit the papers to say, but it is perfectly obvious that the contents of the papers are not dictated from a central office. In Italy they are told what to say; here they are told what not to say; and although the difference may seem only slight in principle, in journalistic fact it means all the difference between a live press and a dead one. The Italian press is now so dead that I doubt if even those who write for it care to read it much. The press here, beneath an accumulation of wartime necessities, is still alive and kicking.

VINCENT SHEEAN, author of the famous book *Personal History*, is a former Chicago newspaper reporter and war correspondent. Unable to keep away from the European war zone any longer, "Jimmy" Sheean left the United States for Europe on April 6.

After witnessing the recent war in Spain, Mr. Sheean had returned to America, rented the house owned by Dorothy Thompson and Sinclair Lewis in Bronxville, and had written a play and several articles.

This special article was cabled to CURRENT HISTORY from Paris a few hours before the Nazis invaded the Lowlands. It paints an interesting picture of life in France as the country awaited the gigantic German onslaught.

Vincent Sheean

THE internal political situation, for example, can be canvassed pretty thoroughly in the press. The great curiosity here is the state of Left, semi-Left and pseudo-Left opinion. The country is, compared to most others in Europe or the world, a country of predominantly Left Democratic or Left Republican opinion. It had a very large Communist party which exercised great influence on the working class and for some years enjoyed the prestige of a political vanguard. After the Nazi-Soviet pact this party was suppressed, its newspapers vanished and its leaders went into prison or hiding. Its disappearance left the Socialist party, which has 152 Deputies in the Chamber, as the ostensible legal custodian of all the Left and Leftist opinion which has been so strong here for many years. The Socialists are now displaying a tendency to split into two parts, with one faction openly talking old-time Socialist pacifism of the sort which was so familiar before 1914.

These are by no means Communists; they are, in fact, anti-Communists; but such is the confusion to which all Left opinion has been reduced since the Nazi-Soviet pact that this faction now advocates a policy hardly to be distinguished from that imposed upon the Communists by their orders from Moscow. The other Socialist faction, still in control, is that headed by M. Leon Blum, and wishes to prosecute the war through to victory over Hitler. The dispute between the two points of view is carried on quite openly, without much difficulty from the censors. We have been told so many stories in America about the "wholesale repression of the Left" in France that it is important to record these clear evidences of free, or relatively free, debate in wartime. Things are not quite so free-and-easy here as they were a year or so ago, but they are still infinitely freer than they are in, for example, that great and peaceful neutral nation, Italy.

If I were in a position to drop a word of warning in American ears, I would say above all to beware of stories about "repression" in France. I had not been in the country twenty-four hours before I learned that some of the worst of the stories circulated in America were false. Specifically on the question of the Spanish Republican refugees I have positive assurance, and *not* from the French, that there was never any pressure brought upon them to return to General Franco's mercies. The propaganda which led to considerable misunderstanding in America, and obscured, for some people, the fact that 98 per cent of everything that has been done for the Spanish Republican exiles was done by the French government, was clearly of Communist origin. It served a purpose which had nothing to do with the welfare of the refugees—which was aimed, like all the rest of the Moscow line at present, at a general blackening and weakening of the western democratic imperialisms.

These confusions of Left opinion are more important in France than elsewhere, because this is, even in wartime, a country much more Leftist in character than any other great power. For example, the Socialist faction here which talks of "a white peace," an indecisive peace, is coinciding for the moment with the Moscow line. The policy of the Kremlin is obviously not directed toward any kind of peace, white, black or red; it is directed toward the prolongation of the war and the weakening of the capitalist powers so that Russia may be at some future date in a predominant position. But this purpose is best served at the present moment by pacifist talk, which contributes, in some degree, to sabotage of the war. The Communists arrested for distributing leaflets in the Metro here are invariably "anti-war" agitators, just as they were "pro-war" agitators up to the time of the Nazi-Soviet pact.

This switching and chopping and changing in the Kremlin policy does not conceal the final purpose, but at times it leads to all sorts of confusion, such as that in which, at the present moment, the French Socialist party, the second largest in the country, finds itself, with an important

(Continued on page 62)

Norway: Fortunate Disaster

The defeat of the Allies in the north gave them a galvanizing shock and highly valuable lessons

BASIL C. WALKER

LT. BASIL C. WALKER, soldier, author, business executive and political and economic observer, is a special war analyst and consultant on world affairs for the *International News Service.*

During the First World War he served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force and afterward was an officer in the military intelligence section of the United States Army Reserve, having been commissioned as an expert on international affairs.

THREE gigantic detonations, setting one another off with rising speed and violence, launched the long awaited, long dreaded total war in the opening days of May. On May 4 the last British troops left obliterated Namsos, surrendering all south and central Norway to the victorious Nazis. In the evening of May 10 Neville Chamberlain was replaced by Winston Churchill as British Prime Minister.

The third and mightiest detonation struck the Netherlands and Belgium in the gray dawn of May 10, and the total war between the main forces of the Allies and Germany was under way before noon. In cause and effect, in tactics and strategy, the war in Norway and that in the Low Countries are closely related.

The Allied defeat in Norway set off the final onslaught which brought down the Chamberlain government and replaced it with that under Winston Churchill. We do not know whether knowledge of the political tension in England accounts for the fact that the German invasion of the Low Countries was launched at the very moment of Chamberlain's last effort to remain in office. That does seem probable.

At any rate, the attack on The Netherlands followed that on Norway in accordance with a familiar pattern of German strategy. That strategy is characterized by an amazing combination of daring in execution and careful preparation aimed at eliminating to the greatest possible degree the element of chance which is inherent in all warfare.

Until the attack on the Low Countries the only really serious military risk that Hitler has run in recent years was when he occupied the Rhineland in March 1936. And that was more a risk of staking policy on his political judgment.

With the Rhineland occupied, it was not hazardous to invade Austria. The Austrian occupation provided a new jumping-off place for Czechoslovakia and protected the German army from the hitherto serious menace of the Czech army. The Protectorates of Bohemia and Moravia and the virtual vassalage of Slovakia served the same purpose for the stupefying blow at Poland.

The jumping-off place for Norway was supplied in part by the entirely riskless operation of overrunning Denmark, but in the development of the Norwegian campaign we saw evidence of the same thorough planning and preparation, to eliminate what might have been the serious hazards of the first German invasion in modern times across an arm of the sea. With Norway occupied throughout its southern part, once again we see the German flank secured by its own armed force in occupation while there is launched the greatest venture by far of the Nazi army—the attack on the Low Countries. That attack itself is likely to be a preparation for a still more decisive blow, at England or France or both.

The occupation of Norway not only protects Germany's relatively vulnerable northern coast from any attack from the north, but provides additional bases for air and submarine operations against the British. Thus, although the titantic struggle in the Low Countries from the Ems estuary in The Netherlands' farthest north down to the Luxembourg frontier, and even from the Moselle east to the Rhine, has recently filled first place in the news, the campaign in Norway has a significant, if now somewhat obscured place in the main war. Norway is not being forgotten by either the Allied or the German High Commands.

The campaign in Norway has another interest for the American public, trying to penetrate the mad confusion of the greater struggle. The Norwegian campaign was like a cross-section of the great struggle now raging. It exposed the ganglions of the great nerve centers of policy and strategy on both sides, and showed in miniature the tactical problems and weapons of the main war. Moreover, being on a smaller scale, it showed them more clearly.

The very dissimilarities of the two battle areas aid us in appraising the tremendous battles on the western front in terms of the smaller campaign. In both, the Germans opened with the Blitzkrieg attack. In both, important tactical successes were obtained from the first weight of the attack. In Norway those successes became decisive, but in the Low Countries and France we find factors of terrain, preparation, personnel and equipment which differ markedly from those which the Nazis encountered in Norway.

On April 9, German troops landed in Norway, at Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim and Narvik. A week to ten days later Allied troops landed at Namsos, Andalsnes, Laerdal and Narvik

and were not withdrawn until between May 5 and 8. Nonetheless, in a military sense, the Allied campaign in south and central Norway was defeated on April 9—a week before the first Allied troops landed.

Three factors settled the fate of the Allied forces in southern and central Norway, all three operating before the Allied troops were ashore. They were: 1) excellent staff work leading to almost perfect co-ordination of the German air, sea and land forces; 2) the well-organized "Fifth Column" activities of the German invaders (further evidence of long and carefully prepared staff plans and, incidentally, the best refutation of the transparent German excuse of being "obliged to forestall an Allied attack"); and 3) absence of satisfactory co-ordination or carefully formulated plans by the Allies.

Of course, the Allies had a far more difficult problem to solve. They had to move their troops by sea a two or three days' voyage, while the Germans had a sea passage of only a few hours to negotiate. Even if they had started simultaneously (which they did not) the Germans would have had absolute assurance of landing long before their enemies. In some countries this advantage might have been only a handicap to the late comers. In Norway, topography and transport facilities make even one day's headstart all but decisive.

The Germans were established at all important seaports, except Narvik a full week before effective Allied forces appeared. For a few days the British seemed able to interfere with German sea communications, and during this period the invaders did not seem well supplied with mechanized forces and artillery. However, by the time the Allies were beginning their landings, it was evident that the Germans were securing sufficient motorized and mechanized equipment to give them great mobility over the few available lines of movement through the mountainous terrain.

Even while arrival of their heavy motorized equipment was delayed (if it was), the Germans were augmenting their numbers by air transport. Winston Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, in the dramatic May 9 debate in the House of Commons gave the Allied land strength in

southern and central Norway as about 12,000 men and the German strength as approximately ten times that number. It is certain that the Germans, in the final week of the campaign, had an immense numerical superiority.

They had much more than numerical superiority. They had ample support of a very aggressive air force. Their motorized equipment enabled them to push forward rapidly from Oslo, their base, over the two main routes into central Norway. They were able to break up Norwegian resistance by the joint use of air and motorized columns and to forestall occupation by the Allied forces even after the latter had landed. Their air forces not only had the benefit of land bases in Norway, but even when they came from Denmark, had less distance to traverse than the air forces of the Allies.

Even after the Allies effected landings, the nature of the country canalized their possible routes of advance through narrow valleys between high mountains. Since the Germans knew these valley routes, their air force could operate both to strafe advancing columns and to bomb communications with great efficiency. The difficulty of dislodging a well-armed enemy, growing constantly in numbers, from positions in such mountainous country is apparent.

But prior occupation of the seaports had given the Germans another advantage, also almost decisive in itself. Once they had begun to land their own motorized and mechanized equipment in quantity, only a force similarly equipped had any chance to meet them with success. However, the only ports they had failed to occupy were little fishing villages in the fjords.

Those who have seen the great docks at which transatlantic liners and large freighters deliver and take on their cargoes, and have also seen the picturesque but unsubstantial docking facilities at small coastal fishing ports, can visualize the problems of the Allies. Their enemies had possession of excellent docking facilities, heavy cranes and hoists, substantial docks, some equipped with railroad facilities at the shipside.

The Allies had the use only of inadequate wooden or rough stone landing piers, without hoisting equipment any more adequate than the ships themselves carried. Moreover, winter's snows still covered much of the ground. Picture the task of unloading trucks, heavy guns, motorized units of all kinds, many single pieces weighing several tons, under such circumstances. Add, that much of the unloading had to be done under intermittent but heavy bombing and machine gunning, and the equipment then somehow gotten up the steep sides of the fjords and inland to where the troops were fighting.

That was the "tactical and transport problem," as the military textbooks would call it. A numerically inferior force, arriving in a mountainous country a week after its enemy, its mechanized equipment coming in very slowly or never getting landed at all, continually harried by a powerful, aggressive air force operating from relatively close land bases, while its own air support on the fighting front was woefully inadequate and handicapped by having only insecure emergency land bases — such was the position of the Allied expeditionary force in central Norway.

Could there have been any other end than "skillfully conducted evacuations"? The Allied troops fought well and exhibited many isolated evidences of aggressiveness. It is easy to say that they could have been better handled in the field, but who is to judge who was not there? A field commander cannot handle forces he does not possess; he cannot make dispositions and launch attacks for which he lacks men and equipment.

In evaluating the Allied campaign

This map reproduced, greatly reduced in size, from one of the four insert maps of the CURRENT HISTORY *War Map of Europe, shows the strategic military objectives stressed not only in this article dealing with the land war but in the following article by Colonel John Callan O'Laughlin. Colonel O'Laughlin deals with the sea and air aspects of the present war.*

in Norway, it must never be forgotten that the forces landed were merely the advance elements of a much larger force which never arrived. Shocking as it may seem to laymen, it is the duty of such an advance force and its commander to assume risks of complete destruction. Their job is to make possible the landing of the main force. If they destroy themselves utterly, but hold the enemy from hurting the main force while landing, they have accomplished their mission. They have won a victory.

THAT the main force does not, cannot arrive, is not their responsibility. That is the responsibility of the higher command. In the last analysis it may be the responsibility of the highest command, the civilian government at home. After all, the armed forces exist only to give effect to national policies, and for those they have only advisory responsibility.

The fighting at Norway, other than at Narvik, represented an Allied defeat. Looked at from the narrow viewpoint of the operation itself, it was an Allied disaster, but perhaps a fortunate disaster. In the first place, only very small forces, probably not one complete division, were involved. In the second place, the Allied force at Narvik in northern Norway was maintained with some moderate chance of victory on its local front.

Here the same factors operated as further south, but distance and terrain modified their effects. Having by able organization and treacherous assistance from the Fifth Column made good their landing at Narvik, the Nazis were too distant to be reenforced or so well supported by air, and were deprived of all but air communications. These factors gave the Allied command some chance of rectifying a disadvantage arising, as in the south, from inferior advance planning and staff co-ordination of air and land power.

This Narvik element draws attention to Winston Churchill's early boast that the Norwegian invasion was a Nazi blunder comparable to Napoleon's invasion of Spain. In one respect, his comparison came truer than he would have wished. Napoleon drove the British army from Spain in the early years of the Peninsular War. Sir John Moore's retreat to

Corunna and the embarkation of his troops in the face of enormously superior forces was also hailed as a brilliant feat of arms. Laymen may smile at such claims about a defeat, but the two most difficult operations in the military art are landing forces on a hostile coast, and re-embarking them under enemy fire. That was true long before air power came along to complicate both problems.

Skill and brilliance cannot alter the fact that a retreat is a retreat, a defeat a defeat. But we can easily get a local reverse out of all perspective. Five years after Sir John Moore fell at Corunna in 1809, another British force and commander with Spanish allies regained Spain and crossed the Pyrenees into France to join in forcing the first abdication of Napoleon. Napoleon himself is authority for the statement that it was the campaign in Spain which broke his military power, quite as much as the Retreat from Moscow.

The great Corsican might have added that the campaigns in Spain brought into high command the Duke of Wellington, the man who conquered him at Waterloo. Hitler's victory in Norway has put at the head of the British government that Englishman whom he and his Nazi followers have long hated above all others, Winston Churchill. Morever, the Norwegian disaster has finally shaken the British people out of a complacency which threatened loss of the war.

It is not on these grounds of high policy alone that the Norwegian campaign may turn out to be, for the Allies, a fortunate disaster. In miniature, but with some completeness, Allied forces have had direct contact with the Nazi Blitzkrieg. They have had a vivid object lesson in the value of exhaustive staff preparation. Above all they have had impressed on them—particularly the British—the absolute necessity of perfect and aggressive co-ordination of all arms. Perhaps the greatest gain is the shattering blow struck at the seductive plausibility of the Liddell Hart theory of "limited war."

Whether these lessons have been learned in time is a question, the answer to which necessarily lies in the future. The Allies now know that every force, energy and resource they possess will not be too much to bring victory. That is something, an important something, for in war, even in mechanized war, the spirit of men is still a vital element. Even the German "Field Service Regulations" say that, "in spite of technique, the worth of man is the decisive factor."

In the attack on the Low Countries, even in the early days, there was evidence that some of these lessons had been learned. Men learn fast with their lives and their homes as the prize of scholarship. Notably, the lesson of the Fifth Column has been learned. This is no spontaneous outbreak of malcontent or defeatist elements in the populace. It is a coldly planned extension of the whole Blitzkrieg attack, an advance party for the advance guard, with a definite military mission.

THE mission of the Fifth Column is manifold. One of its functions is to facilitate the operations of small parties of motorized or parachute troops by preparation and by guidance, lacking which these mobile units would be destroyed without any real chance of accomplishing their important offensive mission. Other assignments for the Fifth Column include spreading confusion in communications; hampering air raid alarms and other defense activities; diverting defense forces from important duties by false information; incendiarism; sabotaging transport, and seizure of important buildings or personages. Modern armies, like all modern technological organizations, are exceedingly vulnerable to destructive attack on certain vital

points. The Norwegian campaign suddenly aroused all nations to the astounding efficiency of the new Fifth Column arm of the German army. The warning has resulted in wholesale arrests and internments. It has been stated, possibly with truth, that these arrests were a factor in precipitating the Nazi blow at the Low Countries. If so, this is striking evidence of the real importance of the Fifth Column in German military calculations.

EARLY war reports from The Netherlands in particular showed that the rounding up of these treacherous enemy agents and their traitorous assistants in the native population hampered the Blitzkrieg activities of the parachute troops, with which the Fifth Column is closely affiliated. Great damage was done by both, but at least the overnight rape of Norway was not repeated.

These parachutists were used in large numbers in the Low Countries for the first time, exceeding in organization and numbers what had been done in Norway, or even in Finland by the Russians. The Nazis in the Dutch and Belgian invasion met with greater success than the Russian parachute troops, but, considering the vastly greater effort put forth in the Low Countries, it is questionable that they were as effective as in Norway. If they were not, it can largely be attributed to the advance warning furnished by the Norwegian experience.

The outstanding characteristics of a Blitzkrieg are surprise, furnished by high mobility, and tremendous striking power. The parachutists are the last word in the surprise element, and are armed to give the maximum firepower possible to troops which above all must depend on swiftness. The parachute attacks in the Low Countries developed two important phases: The co-ordination with Fifth Column agents already on the ground, and the use of disguises (denied by the Germans).

The last is a flat violation of long recognized rules of war (if any such be left), and recalls that other rule, cherished by the Germans, forbidding "francs tireurs," or non-uniformed resistance by civilians. Threatened now with summary execution, so often meted out by them to defenseless civilians, it is perhaps natural that the Germans protest loudly and make terrifying threats of reprisal to the Allies.

If lessons and changes in British governmental direction of the war have resulted from the "fortunate disaster" in Norway, it is also to be remembered that basic conditions in the Low Countries and France are vastly different. In the latter areas there was no question of transporting small bodies of troops long distances by sea. They were only a few hours away. There was no question of preventing the landing of mechanized, motorized and heavy artillery units—they were there and had been for months. The British army in France is actually more motorized than the German or French armies as a whole.

There was no question of seizing the almost defenseless mobilization centers of the unprepared victims of invasion. The Netherlands and Belgium had been mobilized for months. Advances had to be made across well defended terrain. Unfortunately, first possession did not give the advantage conferred on the first comers by Norway's mountains, but advances across the Dutch and Belgian flat lowlands have been costly.

There was still air superiority for the Germans, but the ground forces at least had reasonably adequate air support right on the fighting front. The air arm had at least a fighting chance of supporting the ground forces both directly and by attacks on enemy columns and supply trains and bases in the actual theater of action.

The German attack on the Low Countries had very little, if any, element of surprise, except in such details as the parachute troops. It is well known that General Gamelin, the former Allied commander, had been patiently preparing for this very development since last October.

As to initiative, there is what might be called a passive initiative as well as a positive one. Of the latter, the Germans have given many examples. There is the other initiative, practiced by the patient French commander, of refusing battle until your enemies' needs or temperament lead him to attack on your own chosen line of resistance. In that sense, the Allied High Command has won a strategic victory.

ON how that strategic disposition and victory are exploited hangs the fate of many nations. Not this month or next can the outcome be seen. We may even have to wait longer to see the actual German objective, whether it be England or France or elsewhere. But since the fighting spirit of nations and armies is so decisive in war, it is no exaggeration to say that the galvanizing shock given the Allies, and the British in particular, by their Norwegian defeat may make that reverse truly a "fortunate disaster."

Sea Power *vs.* Air Power

No longer is the "Right, Tight Little Island" sheltered by walls of steel, this author says

COLONEL JOHN CALLAN O'LAUGHLIN

With true understanding of the purpose behind the Nazi invasions of Norway and the Low Countries, Winston Churchill grimly warned his people that deficiency in the air condemned them to difficulty, suffering and danger.

No longer is the "Right, Tight Little Island" sheltered by the walls of steel that supplanted the oak of yesterday. Planes from Southern Norway, unless intercepted, can soar over those walls and within an hour and a half drop their deadly load on Scottish ports. Planes from Holland also can soar over those walls, and within an hour be in a position to bomb the naval stations at Sheerness, Chatham and Portsmouth, and the industrial centers nearby. They can interrupt Channel communications with France and imperil the sea route through the Straits of Dover over which passes much of the food and oil and exports of England.

Unless these air attacks are checked, the British Fleet will be forced to base in West English and Scottish ports, and to refit inadequately and slowly. Thus, the effectiveness of the British blockade fleet would be seriously weakened, communications with France would be hampered, and the life lines around the south of England and the north of Scotland would be badly snarled.

Germany's strategy and objectives are no sudden emanation from the brain of Hitler, but are the product of intense, technical thought applied to the lessons of 1914–18, and directed to a new utilization of air power. It was evident to the students in Berlin that, if German submarine operations had been conducted with more ruthlessness during the World War, victory would have been won despite the British Fleet. This conclusion weakened the old theory that annihilation of an enemy force was an essential preliminary to success. It also strengthened the principle that in the case of an insular power food transport should be denied and the support of the Fleet on shore removed.

Colonel John Callan O'Laughlin, publisher of *The Army and Navy Journal*, was First Assistant Secretary of State under President Theodore Roosevelt. He is the author of the book, *Imperiled America*. A former newspaper man, he has been employed by *The New York Herald*, *The Associated Press*, *The Chicago Tribune* and *The Chicago Herald*.

During the World War, as a representative of American newspapers, Colonel O'Laughlin took a Christmas ship laden with 6,000,000 gifts to war orphans in Europe. He was a delegate to the Progressive National Convention which nominated Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 and in 1933-34 was Assistant to the Chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Colonel O'Laughlin was aide to Major General Goethals, subsequently served in France with the intelligence section of the General Staff, and later was Secretary of the United States Inter-Allied Munitions Council.

Lending themselves to these objectives were the submarine and the airplane, especially the latter, because it could strike the enemy in all his activities, naval, maritime and industrial. But the range of the bomber was limited, and bases for its service had to be acquired nearer to the enemy than Germany. The experience drawn from bombing attacks upon British bases in northern Scotland during the early months of the war confirmed this necessity. Hence the invasions of Norway and the Lowland Countries in order that their territory might be used against England itself as well as fleet bases and channels of supply.

It is a bold and ingenious conception the Germans are seeking to execute, one that forebodes dark days for the British Empire. Prevented by the Treaty of Versailles from building a Fleet comparable to that of Britain, the Reich deliberately accepted inferiority and allayed British fears by signing a Treaty, limiting German building of all classes of ships to 35 per cent of the British construction, submarines excepted.

Such surface vessels as Germany launched were designed for coast protection and operation in waters convenient for speedy retreat, for troop convoy to Norway and the Dutch Coast, and for raiding, as in the case of the ill-fated *Graf Spee*. In other words, it was determined not to challenge England upon the surface of the seas, but to rely upon the submarine, the raider and the plane, to destroy enemy shipping—especially upon the plane to attack the heart of the British Home Fleet.

This decision dismissed the possibility of a defeat at sea, and placed reliance upon neighboring states rather than upon the sea for all vital imports. It contemplated also air offensives to harass enemy maritime traffic, to drive his sea forces from bases, keep them from German shores, and finally to gain a rapid decision by striking at the most sensitive and vulnerable points of England.

Operations in the war to date show how Germany has adhered to this program. Her submarines and planes torpedoed and bombed British shipping, and in the North Sea forced it to hug the Scottish Coast; her planes bombed the Firth of Forth and Scapa Flow, compelling the British Fleet to take up a more distant blockade; and now she is acquiring air stations close to England herself.

Yet, until air attacks on English objectives are effective, England will be able to keep open the arteries of trade upon which her life depends. She will continue to exercise that slow, constricting pressure which sapped the strength and morale of the German people in the first World War. So far neither submarine nor plane nor mine has interrupted the traffic of the United Kingdom. Improved detection devices have resulted in the destruction of at least two-thirds of the underwater force with which the Reich started the war. Moreover, the convoy system has largely protected merchantmen, raiding has been proved disastrous, and new construction plus acquisition of Danish and Norwegian freighters, has far exceeded the British losses at sea. In fact, more damage has been done to the British breakfast table and industry by the Russo-Finnish war and the Scandinavian invasion than by direct attacks upon shipping.

Before the World War, blockade was maintained just off hostile ports, and a passive "come to me" policy was observed by the blockader. This traditional procedure was changed by the submarine, which forced blockaders to a greater distance and a more active use of patrols. The blockade in the current war has required the Allies to lie at a great distance from shore-based aircraft, but this inherent disadvantage is compensated for by opening wide areas to reconnaissance planes which can radio enemy movements to superior surface force.

This change in blockading tactics explains the practical abandonment of the North Sea by the British Fleet and its refusal to enter the Baltic Sea. It accounts also for the partial blockade by the Allies of the Mediterranean accomplished by routing of shipping around Africa, and placing the Fleets at Gibraltar, and near the Suez Canal.

Nevertheless, the blockade is effective in spite of distance. There is not a German ship loose upon the seas. Italy has been forced to rely upon her own shipping and the comparatively small bottom capacity of the United States and Mediterranean neutrals, to handle her trade, now severely reduced. Driven into home or neutral ports, the German Merchant Marine is useful solely for transport purposes, as in the Norwegian operations, and to a minor extent in the attacks against Holland and Belgium.

The control of the seas has another advantage than that of protecting home trade and banning imports to Germany. It is the ability to transport forces at will to threatened points, to remove them in case they are imperiled, and to supply and maintain them. This was demonstrated by the Allies in the Norwegian campaign. Here again, however, German planes placed a limit upon hitherto free movement. Protected by strong forces, troops were landed in central and northern Norway, and when threatened with disaster, were brought back home, or shipped to the Narvik sector.

These operations necessarily imposed long voyages in order that the transports might be outside the range of bombers. Movements had to follow the arc of a circle instead of direct procedure to the objective. They required launching of planes from ships, from hastily assembled rafts, and from inadequate air fields, instead of from land airdromes which the Germans seized at Trondheim and more southern fields. They demanded constant watchfulness for bombing attack upon warships and transports, whose presence was signalled by submarines and by scouting planes.

In these operations came the first real test between the warship and the plane. But, in spite of air deficiencies, both in number of machines and expert personnel, and in operating facilities, Fleet losses were remarkably few. As far as we know now, bombs can sink a submarine, a destroyer and a light cruiser, and, if delivered in sufficient volume, can damage and even destroy a capital ship. They can also ruin instruments for gunnery precision on any ship, reducing the range and effectiveness of its fire. A board of British experts after an exhaustive investigation reported before the war that "capital ships cannot be constructed so as to be indestructible by bombing from the air."

Yet, although the Germans have claimed to have sunk or damaged

This, another insert map reproduced from the Current History *War Map of Europe, also greatly reduced in size, shows Nazi objectives in Belgium, Luxembourg, and France as well as the boundaries of the Maginot Line, the Westwall and the coast line of the North Sea.*

11 battleships — which Winston Churchill sneeringly denied—so far we know that one of this type, the *Rodney*, a battleship, was only slightly damaged after a direct hit.

There are admissions that German bombs sank four Allied destroyers, and some submarines, and that German gunfire destroyed three British destroyers. German claims, as yet unverified, assert that Reich bombers accounted for three additional destroyers as well as five cruisers, a battleship and an aircraft carrier. Allied gunfire riddled two German cruisers, and Admiralty claims add five more cruisers and seven destroyers sunk from this cause.

From authenticated reports it is clear that the weapons we have known—the mine and the gun—have done the most damage, the bomb ranking third in destructiveness, and that the drawbacks of the plane are its low volume of fire, vulnerability, and dependence upon weather.

Nevertheless, waves of planes, as the Norwegian operations demonstrated, can cause terrible damage to an enemy, unless countered by defense plane and anti-aircraft fire. It does not follow, however, that need of air strength lessens the need of gun power, nor that the costly battleship is an anachronism.

If that were true, Germany and Italy would not be building battleships, or the craft which complement them. In fact, nothing to date has established that the day of the floating fortress is over. The range of the airplane inhibits this. Future ships, of course, will be strengthened against air attack, decks will be reenforced, gunnery systems better guarded, and crews at anti-aircraft batteries will be given greater protection. Just as defense eventually overcomes offense, so the battleship will develop. We have seen it in the past in the transformation of the wooden ship into iron and then into steel, and the transformation of the uncompartmented, thin-skinned underwater hull into the cellular and triple or quadruple skin hull of the modern battleship.

The submarine, which at the beginning of the World War, seemed destined to drive shipping from the sea, has been brought within defined limits of service. So we may conclude that, while the air is affecting the design of warships and naval strategy and tactics, it has not usurped their function. Rather it is demonstrating that each has its own sphere of operation. Coordination of all three will be essential for victory in war.

Because the war will be decided on the battlefields neighboring the North Sea, one is apt to overlook the vast area in which the Allies are dominant. More than a third of Germany's merchant marine—309 vessels of 1,530,000 tons—is idle in neutral ports. Smaller and smaller is the percentage of Allied ships sunk by German submarine or mine, a contrast with the mounting casualties of the World War. From Dominions and Colonies and from far off neutrals, supplies of men and materials for the Allies flow without disturbance. Allied warships guard them; German planes cannot reach them. Here we have sea power supreme, and functioning with its age long effectiveness.

If its home bases be protected, if that closer cooperation imperative with the air arm, be achieved, sea power will exercise upon the struggle in progress the compelling influence it has exerted upon the wars of history.

Poison Gas: Terror Over Europe

Gas warfare has demonstrated its efficiency in the past and will be used again, this writer declares

JACK SCHUYLER

DESPITE the report that the Nazis employed "nerve gas" to capture the Belgian fort of Eben Emael and break through the Albert Canal Line, it is generally believed that poison gas has not been used to any extent in the present war, and will not be used until one of the belligerents finds it essential to hasten the war's conclusion.

Meanwhile Italy has five million gas masks ready for free distribution to workers in factory and office. Germany boasts of twelve million members in the *Reichsluftschutzbund*, which sells gas masks and carries on government propaganda. Similarly frenzied preparations for gas defense engross all Europe. In England, bombproof shelters are part of the appeal made in apartment house advertisements, and department stores offer to gas-proof rooms for their customers. Since September, 1938, Britain has spent more than $100,000,000 on air raid precautions. The government has furnished free gas masks to the entire population of forty-six million. Approximately a million and a half protective gas masks for babies have been distributed. These are shaped like a diver's helmet, slipping over the head and shoulders and strapped firmly around the chest. Attached to the helmet is an air pump like a small bellows permitting the mother to pump filtered air to the child. Government officials suggest that, to accustom the baby to his mask, the mother play "peek-a-boo" through the helmet's mica window.

In England, a hundred instructors proficient in the use of gas masks and gas-proofing are graduated from a government school every fortnight. Policemen, firemen, doctors, and Red Cross workers are taught methods of controlling the people in air raids. Motor trucks tour the countryside demonstrating the effectiveness of gas masks. A textbook on chemical warfare has recently been published for secondary schools and colleges. Experiments are outlined for the study and production of the various types of poison gases.

Any nation with a well developed chemical industry possesses the means to manufacture chemical warfare agents. Table salt, water, coal, sulphur, starch or sugar, lime, phosphate rock, arsenic compounds, bromine and bauxite are almost all the materials necessary. Most of these raw materials are everyday articles of commerce, and it is impossible to limit their production. Common industrial substances made from them cannot be controlled. They include chlorine, sulphuric acid, hydrochloric acid, caustic soda, benzol, alcohol, acetic acid, acetone, calcium chloride, bleaching powder, aluminum chloride, sodium chloride and sodium cyanide. With little alteration in equipment and personnel, industrial plants can quickly be converted into wartime plants from which will pour thousands of tons of the deadliest poison gases.

Europe's nervousness at the thought of gas is understandable. Military experts agree that it is impossible to prevent fleets of airplanes from bombarding cities and the civilian population. It is conceivable that poison gases may be dropped as bombs containing enough high explosive to break open the container and disperse the gases. They may also be released in the form of a fine spray or dust. The Italians used both these methods successfully in Abyssinia. However, little is known about the techniques involved in large scale use of poison gases by air forces. To be effective, poison gases must cling to the ground and, if bombs were used to gas a city, many—perhaps half—would hit the housetops and be wasted. To release poison gases as a fine spray airplanes must fly as low as 300 feet, which cannot be done in cities because of tall buildings.

Used against cities, poison gases might prove chiefly important in breaking down morale. Most people are afraid of gas. It is something new, different from other weapons of war. It creates a constant strain of watchfulness, a continuous dread of an ill-understood danger.

Although poison gases were used as long ago as 429 B.C. by the Spartans, the systematic use and exploitation of this new weapon began with the release of clouds of chlorine gas by the Germans on April 22, 1915. The clouds were carried by the wind toward the Allied lines and resulted in at least 5,000 casualties. Death and terror cleared the way to the Channel ports toward which the Germans were driving. Had the military staff realized the disorganization of the Allied troops, the World War might have had a different ending.

Chlorine gas was used because it was easily obtainable from the German chemical industry. By May 3, a hundred thousand crude pads were issued as protection to the front line British troops. By the end of May they were supplanted by a more efficient "veil" respirator. But neither of these protected the eyes, and in June, 1915, the Germans used tear

gases against the Allies. By July the British had developed a gas mask with eye pieces. On December 11, the Germans used phosgene and the British developed the familiar gas mask with a large box. By the end of the war, both sides were using gas profusely.

Poison gases were used to produce casualties a few days before an attack. Mustard gas was especially useful in protecting the flank of an offensive against counter attack, for it made an area completely uninhabitable. Twelve thousand tons of mustard gas were used to produce 350,000 casualties. Poison gases produced 30 per cent of the total casualties during the war. By the end of the war, two of every five shells fired contained them.

The United States Chemical Warfare Service maintains that poison gases are at about the same stage of development as at the end of the World War. Probabilities are against the discovery of more powerful agents of chemical warfare. Mustard gas, for example, was known in 1886, and since then nothing much worse has been discovered. Colonel Augustin Prentiss, foremost authority in the United States, states that, of the 3,000 chemical compounds selected as possible warfare gases, thirty were found suitable, about a dozen were used extensively and not more than six were successful. Yet the efforts of many of the world's leading chemists were concentrated for the four years 1914-18 on this problem.

The term *poison gas* is somewhat of a misnomer, for most of these substances are liquids or solids under normal conditions. The only property they have in common is their injurious effect upon the human organism. They are discharged in various ways. They may be dispersed by means of artillery shells or bombs which violently dispel the liquid or solid in drops or fine particles. Other poison gases may be released in the air by airplanes or tanks and fall to the ground as a fine mist of droplets. Some solids are vaporized by heat and pass into the air as a cloud of very fine particles. A few may be released from cylinders to form a dense cloud which is carried along by the wind.

Four types of poison gas were widely employed during the World War:

1. Lachrymators, or tear gases. A concentration of one part in five million parts of air brings effective action. They produce blinding tears which incapacitate the victim.

2. Sternutators, or sneezing and vomiting gases. Sneezing and vomiting gases require a slightly higher concentration than tear gases for effective action. In low concentration they produce sneezing and, in high concentration, vomiting.

3. Suffocants, or lung irritants. Phosgene is the best known gas belonging to this group. A good dose of one of these gases produces death in forty-eight hours through its action upon the lungs. The victim drowns in his own blood, for the blood plasma fills up the tiny air spaces in the lungs and no air can get in. When the Germans first used phosgene at Vimy, the dying Canadians tore their throats open in an attempt to get air.

4. **Vesicants, or blisterers.** Mustard gas and lewisite are the two chemical agents that belong to this group. Mustard gas is known as the "king of the gases" because it is highly lethal in strong concentrations, inflicting severe burns and blistering of the skin, penetrating all clothing. It contaminates exposed food and drink, which, if consumed, burn the lining of the digestive tract. It persists for days, depending upon the weather.

Except for a slight garlic odor, to which, unfortunately, the victim becomes quickly insensitive, it cannot be recognized. It can produce effects fully six hours after it is released. Since it is much heavier than air, it flows into all surface depressions, cellars, subways and houses, and contaminates everything it touches. A drop of liquid mustard gas left in contact with a man's sleeve for five minutes penetrates the coat and shirt and produces blisters that last for at least six weeks. The story is told of a French director of chemical warfare whose chair was smeared by a penholder dipped in mustard gas. Unknowingly he sat in the chair. He was sent to the hospital with serious burns and his two assistants, in the room at the time, were confined with bronchitis. Mustard gas produced more British casualties than all of the other chemical agents put together.

Lewisite is a colorless oily liquid with, ironically enough, a slight geranium odor. It produces lesions like mustard gas, but after a shorter time and of a more serious nature. The Allies planned to use it in extensive and systematic raids against the cities of Germany in 1919.

There are champions of gas warfare who maintain that it is the most humane type and that popular beliefs concerning the horrible effects of poison gases are highly exaggerated. These proponents, represented by J. B. S. Haldane, British biologist, and by the Chemical Warfare Service in the United States, declare that poison gases do not mutilate the body, seldom cause extreme pain and result in death in only a small percentage of cases. During the World War, only 2 per cent of American gas casualties died as compared with 24 per cent of battle casualties. Professor Charles L. Parsons, former Secretary of the American Chemical Society, states that gas was responsible for 30 per cent of the total casualties

(Continued on page 62)

Italy's Theater of War

Mussolini, master strategist, has played shrewdly to make the utmost of his country's advantages

HENRY C. WOLFE

—Foreign correspondent; author of The German Octopus

By the time these lines appear in print Italy may have entered the war. No one can now say definitely what Mussolini will do. It is quite possible that even the Duce does not know for certain. The question of Italy's future course of action is probably finding an answer in the titanic struggle now proceeding in Belgium and France. If Hitler wins this phase of the war decisively and seems certain to emerge the victor at the end of the conflict, Mussolini will undoubtedly throw his armed support to the Reich. If, on the other hand, the Duce is not convinced that the Nazis will win the war, he will probably continue his policy of "non-belligerency."

The Duce's attitude seems pretty sordid to a good many Americans. It looks like a form of international blackmail. But Europeans recognize it for what it is: power politics. Most of us do not admire power politics. We look upon it as a form of international racketeering. But if we wish to understand what is happening in the Old World, and why, we must try to understand the methods and motivations of power politics. For European affairs have been dictated by this sordid system since the first World War.

In the field of power politics Signor Mussolini is recognized as a master strategist. He has never held many high cards in his hand, yet he has often played brilliant international poker. At times he has bluffed successfully; at other times he has played his poor cards so expertly that he has defeated opponents who held strong hands. Four years ago he teamed with Adolf Hitler. Since that event the Fuehrer's winnings have been enormous; the Duce's have not been impressive. For the past nine months Hitler has been taking the risks; Mussolini has been playing shrewdly in an effort to win if Hitler wins, but not to lose if the Nazis lose.

Let us look for a moment at the cards in the Duce's hand. His good cards are: a population about as large as that of France, a modern industrial system, a strategic location that commands the central part of the Mediterranean, a common frontier with his German ally, a good air force, a small but modern navy and an aggressive political leadership. But there are some very bad cards in his hand: the poor strategic location of Italian industry near the French border, the serious deficiency of nearly all important raw materials, a long coast line that must be defended from superior Franco-British fleets, an Allied blockade that can be effective from Suez and Gibraltar, the certainty that Ethiopia would be cut off from Italy by the British navy, and the possibility that the Italians would have to wage war on at least three, possibly six, fronts.

In view of Italy's dependence upon imports of food and raw materials, we may take it for granted that the Duce has never seriously considered engaging in a long war. The hazards would be too great. Italy's only chance of winning a conflict against the great Western naval powers is to strike hard, in conjunction with her German ally, and win quickly.

Perhaps the Allied blockade is more effective than the Fuehrer believed possible; perhaps the severe winter and floods have cut down Germany's food prospects in the Reich and the Balkans to an alarming extent; perhaps the expected help from Russia has proven chimerical. In any event, Hitler has dropped his defensive role and taken the offensive. He has gambled everything on his ability to win the war this year. As a consequence, the Duce has been forced to choose.

If the Duce waits too long, he will not only incur German wrath but invite the punishment of being deprived of any of the fruits of victory. But Mussolini has not had an entirely free hand in Italy. The Vatican, the House of Savoy and many influential people have been opposed to Italian participation in the war. There is, too, among the Italian people a latent fear of Germany. Most important of all, Italy, grown tired of war, has needed a period of recuperation from the conflicts in Ethiopia, Spain and Albania.

On the other hand, Italians have been inspired by dreams of a great empire.

The Duce, in the role of Benito Africanus, has pointed to the shores of North Africa as the natural field of Italian expansion. The Mediterranean, he has proclaimed, is *Mare Nostrum.* But even the most naïve citizen of Italy knows that his country does not control a sea whose gates at Gibraltar and Suez are held by British naval power.

Partly to gain additional territory for settlers, markets and sources of raw materials, Italy joined with the British and French in the first World War. By the secret Treaty of London (April 26, 1915) Italy was promised certain "compensations" when the German African colonies were to be divided among the victors. Rome was also promised a large slice of Austro-Hungarian territory along the eastern coast of the Adriatic. But at the peace conference, the Italians charge, the Allies broke their promises to Italy. Bitter memories of this period still rankle in Italian breasts. There is also the old feud left from the days of the Ethiopian aggression when

Britain led the campaign for sanctions against the Duce's empire.

The Duce suspects that if the Allies win the war they will treat him even more arbitrarily than they treated post-Armistice Italian leaders. He realizes that this war may be his last chance to build a great empire. In view of the way African territory is allocated today, he cannot hope to go down in history as Benito Africanus unless he is able to gain control of lands now held by the Western powers.

As a belligerent Italy must try to build up her security in Europe and expand her colonial territory in Africa. She must try to gain control of the Mediterranean by extending her air and naval bases, removing French and British bases that threaten Italy and securing possession of the gateways to the Middle Sea at Suez and Gibraltar. Alone, Italy could do little against Franco-British military and naval power. As the ally of Germany, Italy's naval and air forces fighting in the comparatively narrow waters of the Mediterranean might be able to contribute to an Axis victory.

Along her French frontier Italy might be expected to strike at France through the air. The important French cities of Lyon and Marseilles are within easy bombing distance from Italian air fields. On the ground, however, Italy probably would not be able to strike effectively at France. The valleys which connect the two countries converge in Italy, making for a concentration of French invaders of Italy but a scattering of Italian invaders of France. Nevertheless, Italy's participation in the war would necessitate a considerable force of French soldiers along the Italian border, troops that might be badly needed to repel the German drive against France.

On Italy's eastern frontier is her old enemy Yugoslavia. Ever since the first World War Italian-South Slav relations have been marked by a series of crises. Not only does Italy cover the eastern shore of the Adriatic; she would like to establish political and economic hegemony over the Yugoslavs. Her Albanian territory juts into the western flank of Yugoslavia. Hungary, an Italian protege, stands poised on the South Slavs' northern frontier. Before Italian territorial aspirations are satisfied, Yugoslavia is certain to lose some of its lands to the Duce.

For several months Italy has been steadily increasing her military garrisons in Albania. Large groups of Italian "colonists" and "laborers" have been arriving in Albanian regions adjacent to the Yugoslav and Greek frontiers. The Greeks have been badly frightened, fearing that Mussolini is preparing to launch an offensive against them with Salonika as its objective.

The Duce's occupation of Salonika would be used to thwart the establishment of an Anglo-French military base and would serve as a starting point for an Italian campaign to take from Turkey control of the Dardanelles. For the Dardanelles are a third gateway to the Mediterranean that Italy would like to hold. If this invaluable strategic region were in Italian hands, the Duce could close it to Russian warships or merchant vessels that tried to leave the Black Sea.

For several years Italy has been striving to organize powerful "Fifth Columns" in Syria, Palestine and Egypt. The Italian residents of those three countries form a small but important part of the Duce's "Trojan Horses" in eastern Mediterranean territory. Italy's real hopes have rested in the Arab nationalists who have fought British and French rule.

At the other end of the Mediterranean the British fortress of Gibraltar stands guard. No Italian surface ship can pass this great rock without Britain's permission. In early May several Fascist spokesmen asserted that the British fortifications at Gibraltar were obsolete and that Italian air power could render this harbor untenable for British ships. It is 1,166 air miles from Rome to Gibraltar; it is about 850 air miles from Sardinia to Gibraltar. Italian expectations of wresting Gibraltar from the English are not, however, built upon the destructiveness of Italian bombing planes. They can attack but not get control of the fortress. If the Duce seriously hopes to drive the British from Gibraltar he is banking on Spanish help.

Spain today, it is true, is recovering from a long, devastating civil war. General Franco needs time and peace to reconstruct his shattered country. At the same time he is under an enormous debt to the Duce. For without Mussolini's aid it is extremely doubtful that Franco could have beaten his Loyalist enemies. Can the Duce prevail upon Franco to enter the war and launch a land attack against the British at Gibraltar? At this writing perhaps neither the Duce nor Franco knows the answer to that question.

Little more than fifty miles off the southern coast of Sicily lies the island of Malta, a British possession. With 122 square miles of territory and a quarter of a million inhabitants, Malta is not important economically, but it is strategically. As a naval base, it has been a half-way point for British naval units between Gibraltar and Suez. A few years ago it seemed impregnable against Italian attack. Today, Italian bombers based in Sicily might play havoc with British ships stationed at Malta. In fact, Malta may become untenable for the British.

About 130 miles west of Malta, strategically located between Sicily and the French protectorate of Tunis, lies the small Italian island of Pantelleria. Of no economic importance, it is of great value to the Duce as an air base. For it practically commands the waters between Sicily and Tunis. It may serve to block the passage of Allied surface ships. Pantelleria is one of the good cards in the Duce's poker hand.

Italy, strategically based in the Mediterranean, wants Tunisia from France, a share in the Suez Canal, the French Red Sea port of Djibati which leads to Ethiopia,—and from there a corridor through Egypt to Libya. This is the dream of Benito Africanus.

We have been speaking largely in terms of Italian efforts to win security and destroy enemy bases. Now we turn to the expansionist program envisaged by Benito Africanus.

In the expansionist program Tunis looms large. Located only about 100 air miles from Sicily, Tunis would be a rich prize for the expanding Fascist empire. Not only does it produce food and some raw materials; it would provide living space for Italy's overflow population. At present many of these immigrants go to other parts of the world and are lost to the Italian empire. But settled in Tunis under the Italian flag they would swell Italy's population and provide more recruits for the Duce's army.

Tunis, however, is a valuable part of the French colonial system and France will never give it up except by force. In 1881, when the crafty Bismarck encouraged France to seize Tunis, he prepared the ground for today's clash of rival French and Italian empires in North Africa. For the Iron Chancellor foresaw that the French occupation of Tunis would become a perennial bone of contention between these Mediterranean neighbors. And this would indeed be grist for Germany's mill of power politics.

Libya, Italy's largest colony, is located between French Tunis and Algeria on the west and Egypt and the Sudan on the east. Marshal Italo Balbo, leading Fascist airman, is governor of this sandy, sparsely populated territory. A belligerent Italy might attempt to strike out both east and west from Libya. At the same time Libya might be invaded from Tunis and from Egypt. But the fighting on the hot sands of North Africa would probably not have a decisive effect on the war as a whole. Even if the British and French completely conquered Libya, the Duce might emerge from the war with Egypt, Tunis and Algeria in his possession. On the other hand a victorious Italian campaign in North Africa might precede the destruction of the Italian empire. But no matter what the outcome may be in Africa it will certainly not decide the issue of the war in northern Europe.

It is the fighting between the Germans and Allies in France and Belgium (and perhaps in Switzerland) that will undoubtedly seal the fate of the Mediterranean empires, both democratic and Fascist and little else will matter.

In the meantime, Benito Mussolini strives to influence the outcome of the second World War. Whether he is a "non-belligerent" ally helping the Fuehrer on the political and economic fronts, or a full fledged combatant who stakes everything on the success of Hitler's *Blitzkrieg*, he is working to make the Middle Sea actually *Mare Nostrum* to Italians. And he is pushing his campaign to create a vast Mediterranean empire on the far-flung site of Rome's ancient greatness. The question is will he be able to go down in history as Benito Africanus?

Hitler's Himmler

The mailed fist of the German Nazis— his violent work and his diffident ways

FREDERIC SONDERN, JR.
With Albert Grzesinski, Former Chief of Germany's Secret Police

FOR a long time, the statesmen of London and Paris thought wishfully that discontent and revolt within the Reich would eventually topple Adolf Hitler from his dictatorial throne. Many think now —even more wishfully—that the rebellion of the peoples he has conquered, and the collapse of morale in Germany itself under the rigors of a long war will make him share the fate of Kaiser Wilhelm.

These hopes have been disappointed in the past, and seem destined to defeat in the future by the genius, the efficiency, and the remorseless, cold fanaticism of one man—Heinrich Himmler, police dictator of Germany and leader of the Fuehrer's private army. He has created the greatest police system in history. It brought Hitler to power, it has smashed every attempt to shake him, and, as his napoleonic campaign spreads over Europe, it follows in the army's wake to crush into a bleeding pulp every territory where opposition might grow dangerous.

What Police Minister Joseph Fouche did for Napoleon, Heinrich Himmler — Reichsfuehrer of the *Schutzstaffel*, Chief of the German Police, and Inspector of the *Gestapo* —is doing for Hitler, but with a brutal savagery and effectiveness unknown 150 years ago.

Among the Fuehrer's satraps, Himmler has always been inconspicuous. Now a man of forty, he looks like a provincial German schoolmaster. Below medium height, he has sharp features, a receding chin, and a pince-nez which he fastens precisely to the bridge of his nose. They make his steel helmet and natty black uniform look slightly silly. His speeches are poor and he delivers them, only when he absolutely has to, in a thin, reedy voice and with wooden gestures which remind one of the country yokel. Society—grown very important among the parvenue potentates of Berlin—also embarrasses him and his colleagues make fun of him, behind his back of course, for his exaggerated bowings and heel-clickings.

"Gentle Heinrich" Himmler

While Goering, Goebbels, and even the ascetic Hitler have built huge palaces and surrounded themselves with byzantine pomp, Himmler lives in a simple small villa in a Berlin suburb with his wife and little girl. Frau Himmler, daughter of a Bavarian farmer, dislikes servants and does most of the cooking and housework herself. Whatever time off Himmler has from his gruelling ten hour workday, he devotes to "Pippi," his ten-year-old daughter Gudrun, on whom he dotes.

The sybaritic Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, his best friend, has often tried to "reform" him. "For heaven's sake," Ribbentrop exploded once, "you're the second most powerful man in Germany. Why don't you get yourself a proper house and have some fun? You can't work all the time."

Himmler removed his pince-nez and polished them, as he does in moments of embarrassment. "Oh, I couldn't do that," he stammered. "I wouldn't know what to do with it. I've always been a simple man. My work and my family are the most important things to me."

"Quite a contrast," murmured one of the Nazi leaders present when Ribbentrop told the story later. A contrast indeed. After the terrible pogrom last year, which Himmler directed personally, he came home and played charming host to a children's party which his adored "Pippi" was giving. He is even unobtrusive about his bodyguard, which most of the Nazi satraps display with joy as an outward and visible sign of their importance. At the Opera, one of his few relaxations, his guards are always carefully concealed. And when he drives through Berlin, the cars in front and behind are apparently—but only apparently—innocent civilian automobiles. As a sort of present to "Pippi," Ribbentrop finally persuaded him to buy a country house for $20,000 on the Tegernsee in the Bavarian Alps. Himmler still worries about its "ostentatiousness."

Just fifteen years ago, some of the Nazi inner circle were sitting around a table in a Munich beer-hall. Adolf Hitler was still imprisoned in Landsberg Fortress, so his deputy and right hand—the druggist Gregor Strasser—held court in his place. Among those present was Heinrich Himmler. Strasser was expounding National Socialistic virtues.

"Now take my secretary, for example—our gentle Heinrich here," he said, putting his hand on Himmler's shoulder. "He's a good clerk. Thorough and precise. Wonderful brain for figures and organization. But he'll never go far in the Movement. He's too mild. He thinks and looks like a little bookkeeper—a little bourgeois." The gentle Heinrich blinked owlishly behind his glasses, smiled his thin smile, and, as usual, said nothing. The other Nazis agreed with their chief.

On the "night of the long knives"

in June, 1934, Strasser and some hundreds of other "old fighters" in the Party discovered how wrong they had been, when *Rollkommandos* of Himmler's black-coated troopers riddled them with bullets where they stood or sat. Many—whole nations, in fact—have made the same mistake, and also paid for it with their lives. For the gentle Heinrich, behind his "bookkeeper's" exterior, has a will of iron and a power which is—next to the Fuehrer's—unquestionably and unquestioned the greatest in the Reich.

As Reichsfuehrer of the *Schutzstaffel*—the black-coated elite guard of the party—Himmler has now mobilized 450,000 heavily armed, brilliantly trained, completely motorized and fanatically loyal men—the pick of Germany's youth—under his absolute command. The *S.S.*, as it is called, was originally intended as the domestic shock-troop of the Nazi organization. It formed the bodyguard of Hitler and his satraps, guarded the concentration camps, and put down any civil disturbance which arose in the Reich. Himmler has now made it into a regular army, complete in every detail with tanks, artillery and air force of its own. It is these troops which have shattered Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway and the Low Countries.

The *Wehrmacht*, the regular army, marched in and did the necessary orderly shooting and bombing. But it was Himmler's forces which "consolidated" the army's gains with mass executions and forced migrations unparalleled in European history. The rôle of the *S.S.* in Poland, where Himmler was Special Commissar, will probably go down as one of the blackest chapters of this century's story. Hundreds of thousands of Polish men, women and children were dragged from their homes and dumped without sufficient clothing, food, or shelter in the "concentration areas" to starve and die. Those guilty of any resistance were hanged in the public squares on rolling gibbets, which were then towed around the streets for all to see. The gentle Heinrich had decided that depopulation was the best solution of the Polish problem. And his troopers carry out his orders to the letter. Hitler himself finally intervened to stop the butchery, but it has only been modified. Czechoslovakia and the others have not fared quite as badly. But it is Himmler's army which the small neutrals, those already invaded and those about to be, fear far more than the soldiers and even the bombs of the *Wehrmacht*.

Within the "Old Reich" itself, Heinrich Himmler has for seven years mown down and blown apart every nucleus of discontent which might have grown into a dangerous movement. As Inspector of the Secret State Police—the *Gestapo*—he is responsible to Hitler alone. And Hitler, having little patience with such details, lets his trusted paladin do what he likes. He may arrest, try, and sentence to concentration camp or death without recourse to any regular process of justice.

Many an unfortunate Berliner has been dragged from his bed at six in the morning, hustled to the grim old building in the Prinz Albrechtstrasse, and was dead or on his way to concentration camp by six in the evening. The *Gestapo* is Himmler's brainchild, staffed with the best minds picked from the *Schutzstaffel* and from the veteran detectives of the criminal police. The 2500 agents have all been trained in special schools for political work, organized and watched over by Reinhard Heydrich—Himmler's Mongol-eyed, swarthy, machiavellian and notoriously cruel young chief assistant. Supporting them is a vast network of spies and stool-pigeons all over the Reich in every walk of life—in shops, offices, factories, hotels, restaurants, universities, in the army, navy, and air force—everywhere.

They are paid only when they report something of value, but well and promptly, so that the volume of information flowing into the local *Gestapo* stations is enormous. Everything interesting is sent on to the Berlin headquarters, where a staff of about 200 is kept busy doing nothing but sorting, indexing and filing these reports. The special telephone exchanges which tap all lines that interest the *Gestapo* also provide a large quota of death-dealing indiscretions. When something important turns up, *Gestapo* agents are put on the trail. They have almost unlimited powers. But actual arrests are generally made by *S.S.* squads, who monopolize all bracchial violence.

Himmler himself keeps very close watch on the *Gestapo*, and, as he likes the work, frequently questions prisoners. It is at such times that the real nature of Strasser's "little bookkeeper" comes out. His voice rises to a shrill scream, the blinking, watery eyes are venomous, and even the strongest quail before his savage gestures. Almost a million Germans have passed through the cellars of the building in the Prinz Albrechtstrasse—and its branches all over the Reich — into concentration camps during the past seven years. Many of them, to a speedy death.

The concentration camps also are an invention of the gentle Henry and are run by the Death Head Brigade, a section of his *Schutzstaffel*. They were set up originally for Jews and Communists. But since their inception, a great many "Aryan" Nazis have also suffered their tortures, for as little as a careless word—"I think the Fuehrer is wrong about . . . ." It was Heydrich's idea to pick the most cruel degenerates he could find as guards for these institutions, which explains the barbarous brutality at Dachau, Sachsenhausen, and the other camps which has so shocked the world.

A very special development of Himmler's, of which he is extremely proud, is *UA 1*—the foreign division of the *Gestapo*. Its 5000 agents abroad keep track of Germans outside the Reich, watch all connections between Reich citizens and the outer world, and organize the corruption and sabotage of foreign governments. They have booked some remarkable scores of late. *UA 1* made painstaking preparations, months in advance, for Austria and Czechoslovakia — its agents working comfortably from German Embassies, Consulates, and "travel agencies." In both these countries, every important anti-Nazi—and there were many—was under lock and key within twenty-four

hours after their governments fell. In Poland, the defending army's communication system was completely disrupted. In Norway, *UA 1* almost succeeded in kidnapping King Haakon, and did paralyze effective resistance with coups that amazed and startled the world. The "Fifth Column" has entered military strategy in a big way. *UA 1* put it there.

Another of Himmler's prerogatives is the guarding of Adolf Hitler himself. Three thousand of the tallest, most reliable and blindly obedient *S.S.* men form the *Leibstandarte Adolf Hitler*—the Fuehrer's own pretorian guard. They have a more comprehensive military training than even the best regular *Wehrmacht* regiment, and in their well-tailored black uniforms are probably the most impressive unit in the world. Three hundred of them guard Hitler when he is in residence at Berchtesgaden. One hundred surround the Chancellery in the Wilhelmstrasse when he is in Berlin—and the rest of the 3000 are within easy call at their palatial barracks in the nearby suburb of Lichterfelde. They went ahead into Austria and Czechoslovakia to make sure the way was safe for the Fuehrer. And they form the phalanxes that surround him whenever he appears in public. There is nothing that goes on around the Fuehrer which is not seen or heard by the *Leibstandarte*, and which is not promptly reported to Heinrich Himmler.

With the *Gestapo* as his eyes, and the *Schutzstaffel* his striking arm, Himmler is politically unassailable. He has collected dossiers of the weaknesses and "irregularities" of even the highest of the Party. Berlin wits say that he has one of himself. And with them, he has killed or fought to a standstill everyone who has ever tried to stand in his way to power, including the mighty Hermann Goering and the leaders of the General Staff. Many—from Ernst Roehm to General von Fritsch—have had to die for their opposition. He has deposed one War Minister and two Chiefs of Staff. Eight members of Hitler's cabinet wear the uniform of the *S.S.* Goering, Goebbels, and the rest tread softly in his presence. And Hitler leans on him so that it is obvious that Himmler will speak a cardinal word in Europe as long as the National Socialistic regime survives.

"And you know," an intimate friend of Himmler's remarked to us about a year ago, "the remarkable thing is that he's not a genius. He's a fanatic in a way, but he's a cold

fanatic. He's a hater, but a cold hater. He's the only calm man in a crowd of violently emotional and often hysterical mystics. That is probably the reason for his success. He has built the foundation on which Hitler stands—right from the beginning."

Heinrich Himmler was born in the quiet little hamlet of Lindau on the shore of beautiful Lake Constance in the Bavarian Alps. His father, a respected school-supervisor and pious Catholic, had hopes of Heinrich's following his footsteps and saw to a thorough education in the classics. But the war interfered and, at seventeen, young Himmler joined the 11th Bavarian Infantry Regiment. But he saw World War I from behind a desk. His superiors quickly discovered his knack for dealing with the innumerable reports and requisitions which were a specialty of the German army. In post-war Munich, his conservative, farmer's mentality revolted against the Communists, who then ruled Bavaria, and he quickly gravitated into the circle which was beginning to grow around Adolf Hitler, the young firebrand.

Himmler found a job in a fertilizer factory near Munich, but he neglected his business as much as he could for the much more attractive intrigues of "the Movement." Hitler fascinated him and there began the abject hero-worship which has lasted through the years. Hitler's oratory held him spellbound. He drank in "the Austrian's" words, and his ideas. And since has been a more violent hater of Jews and Communists, Freemasons and Jesuits—whom he somehow lumps all together—than even Julius Streicher, the "madman of Nuremberg." Himmler even grew a moustache like Hitler's—only a little smaller, to show his respect—which he wears today. And he joined the "Freikorps Reichsflagge," one of the many anti-red terroristic organizations in Munich.

In the abortive Putsch of 1923, Himmler was among the marchers so ignominiously routed by the Munich police. But he managed to be in a detachment which "surrendered honorably" before even the first salvo raked the Heldenplatz, and escaped going to jail with Hitler and his "paladins." During the next two years, having lost his job in the factory, he eked out a meager living doing odd jobs for the new National Socialist Party as Gregor Strasser's secretary, and studied agriculture at the University of Munich in hopes of becoming a poultry farmer.

In 1925, a slipshod, easy-going government set Hitler free, and he arrived back in Munich breathing fire. Full of plans thought out in the seclusion of Landsberg Fortress, he began a complete overhaul of his party. On Strasser's suggestion, Himmler got his first promotion. He became Nazi Business Manager for Lower Bavaria.

Being a Nazi in those days was not all beer and skittles. Meetings frequently broke up in a hail of Communist brickbats. Hitler conceived the idea of organizing a special group of strong-arm men armed with heavy canes—a protective corps or *Schutzstaffel*—to disperse would-be hecklers. Himmler joined, primarily to be near the Fuehrer whenever he spoke. By 1927, he was its deputy-chief and his career began.

With the methodical, scientific thoroughness of which he alone was capable, the gentle Henry made his disorganized gang of roughnecks into a vote-getting machine second to none. The Intelligence Section of his *Schutzstaffel* charted the political setup of every town and village in

Bavaria. The Propaganda Squad deluged the doubtful with fiery rhetoric. And the Disciplinary Columns beat up active opponents.

Nazi representation in the Reichstag in Berlin began to grow. By 1929, when Himmler became commander of the *Schutzstaffel,* he had over a hundred thousand well armed, trained men—the toughest and most intelligent in the party, completely loyal to Hitler and himself. And when, in 1930, he became a member of the Reichstag, he was ready to start work on a national scale. He had all the important anti-Nazis in the country shadowed and investigated by his *S.S.* and compiled the proscription lists which were executed with such speed and precision on the night of the Reichstag fire, some three years later.

The efficiency with which the Weimar Republic was unseated, thousands arrested, and police stations all over the Reich occupied by the *S.S.* was perhaps the most outstanding revolutionary feat in history.

Only Himmler could have accomplished it. Hitler rewarded him with the Police Presidency of Munich, and successively in the following months with command of the entire German political and criminal police—except in Prussia, where Hermann Goering refused to relinquish his power, and established a police of his own. Himmler didn't make an issue of Goering's opposition. He organized his *Gestapo,* strengthened his *Schutzstaffel,* and sat down to wait. His chance soon came.

During these years, Hitler had come to rely more and more on the gentle Heinrich and his black-shirted legions. The Storm Troops of the party—the brown-shirted S.A.—had grown into a vast organization of 1,200,000 men. A large percentage of them was riffraff from the gutters, poorly disciplined, unreliable, and unwieldy. Their leader, Ernest Roehm, had once fought bitterly with Hitler and deserted him for a better job organizing the Bolivian army. Since his return, he had become increasingly ambitious and insistent on a "real revolution" which would bring his forces to power. But in the meanwhile, Hitler had made his pact with the Rhineland industrialists who financed him and the Reichswehr Generals who protected him. Roehm and the proletarian *S.A.* were not only an embarrassment but also a danger. Hitler spoke with Himmler and Goering about it. And on the night of June 30, 1934, the *Schutzstaffel* moved.

Himmler's *Gestapo* had "discovered" an *S.A.* "plot" to seize power. By morning the keymen of the *S.A.* were dead—and a large number of others who happened to be old enemies of Himmler's.

With Roehm dead and the *S.A.* shattered, the *Schutzstaffel* and the *Gestapo* became the mainstays of the regime. Hitler finally persuaded Goering to give up his private monopoly of power in Prussia, and made Himmler supreme police chief of the entire Reich. Supplied with unlimited funds, the gentle Heinrich now had what he wanted, and needed no urging to realize his ambitions. He set to work to make his organization a permanent one. "I have read all there is about the great police systems of the world," he said at that time to a foreign diplomat—in his deceptively diffident way. "I will improve on Fouche and Yagoda. I will create something to surpass them all. Something that will stay with Germany for a thousand years."

He has made his *Schutzstaffel* into what he calls an "aristocracy of blood" and drums into them day after day that they are a privileged class within the Reich. The *S.S.* man is chosen on the basis of a complicated formula—including an "Aryan" pedigree which must go back to 1750—from the pick of those who at the age of 21 have completed their compulsory Labor and Military service.

Since *S.S.* membership facilitates later entry to the "Fuehrer Schools" and the best political jobs, Himmler has been able to draw from the best German families. To create tradition—dear to the Teutonic heart—Himmler has given his *S.S.* an intricate semi-chivalric, semi-pagan, mystic ceremonial. If two *S.S.* men have a serious quarrel, they must submit their difference to a "court of honor," which may order a duel to the death. The *Schutzstaffel* celebrates the "solstice" — the ancient Germanic Christmas.

It is not easy for the *S.S.* to marry. Their brides must be of the purest Germanic type and must pass an exhaustive examination on ideology and aptitude for motherhood. In the meantime Himmler not only allows but encourages his men to have as many illegitimate children as possible. Unmarried mothers of *Schutzstaffel* offspring are cared for gratis in palatial hospitals, the largest of which—in the Bavarian Alps—has been aptly named *Lebensborn,* "Well of Life," by the poetic Heinrich.

In 1938 Hitler called on Himmler to take on the most dangerous job of his career. In February, the General Staff had rebelled against the Fuehrer's plan for marching against Austria. Himmler supplied the dossiers which enabled the Fuehrer to remove the objectors. Generals von Blomberg and von Fritsch fell. The charge against Fritsch turned out to be a pure Himmler invention. But Austria was invaded. In September, another purge was necessary to persuade the General Staff to attack Czechoslovakia. Himmler again supplied the necessary material, and by the end of the year, 17 Generals and several hundred officers had been relieved of their commands. Before the Polish campaign, Himmler again had to do some prodding. As a result of these purges there has been friction and very bad blood between the *Wehrmacht* and the *Schutzstaffel.* Particularly the older officers of the Prussian Junker caste have snubbed Himmler and his troops on every possible occasion. But Hitler's prestige with the army has been raised to such a height by the recent successes that he can personally crush any serious clashes which might arise. And he needs Heinrich Himmler—badly. He has exempted Himmler's men—although they are the best military material in the Reich—from actual front-line duty. If the tide of war turns against him, he will need that loyal half million to keep his regime going. If he wins, he will need the gentle Henry to steady him.

"Heinrich Himmler," Hitler has said, "has the clearest head in the country. He is a machine."

American Eagles in the Air

The United States is pointing to complete air supremacy and at the present rate this will very soon be a reality

DON WHARTON

(The essential point of this article, written before President Roosevelt asked Congress for 50,000 planes a year is strengthened by the President's message.)

THE UNITED STATES is becoming the world's greatest air power. Nothing can prevent it. Our supremacy in the air will presently be as obvious as was Britain's supremacy on the seas. This is not boastful prophecy.

Partly through our own contriving, partly through the accidents of history and geography, the United States is now building the planes, the factories, the laboratories and the personnel which add up to supreme air power, military and commercial.

Our total strength of war planes is being pushed up to 8,000 or 8,500. Gigantic systems of air bases are being hewn out of American wildernesses from the Arctic to the tropics. Our civilian pilot reservoir has been increased nearly 10,000 in a single year. Our aircraft production facilities have been doubled and are still increasing. We are becoming the war plane arsenal for half a dozen nations. We are rapidly getting a stranglehold on the world's commercial market.

In the army and navy combined we have today about 4,500 planes, including reserves, trainers, cargo and experimental craft and those which are obsolete and obsolescent. June next year will find us with nearly 5,500 planes in the Army Air Corps alone; a decreasing percentage will be obsolete and obsolescent; 4,400 will be less than three years old, 300 less than a year old. Today we have only thirty-nine Flying Fortresses but these long-range bombers are rolling out of Boeing's Seattle plant at the rate of one every four working days. By June 1941 we shall have over 175 Flying Fortresses. Some writers have complained we have too few, but nobody else has any at all. The navy expects to have close to 3,000 planes within a year.

Paralleling this increase of planes are two far-flung systems of air bases—the navy's and the army's. Each sweeps in a great U from Alaska down to the Canal Zone and Puerto Rico, thence up the Atlantic seaboard to New England. Roughly one third of the bases are built; two thirds are under hurried construction at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. They will give us coverage over a tremendous area in which there is no foreign air base except Britain's near Botwood, Newfoundland. They will give us a reach out to the east and west, to the south, and to the north, the top of the globe which some strategists expect eventually to become the key of the air world. From these bases one-fifth the surface of the globe is within our present bombing radius. Forty per cent of the globe is closer to these American air bases than to the bases of any other air power.

Planes, as General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, has testified, "are not weapons until supplied with trained combat and maintenance crews." A training program is providing pilots and ground crews for all the planes we shall build.

We are also getting a huge personnel reservoir. Closely collaborating with the army, the Civil Aeronautics Authority is financing civilian air training in 437 colleges; the goal set last summer was to train 11,000 during the 1939–40 school year. In many cities local sponsors are raising additional funds to provide extra scholarships; some corporations are following suit. Aside from this program private flying is booming as never before. The C.A.A. expects certified civilian pilots to number 40,000 by summer—more civilian fliers than in any other nation—and 95,000 by 1944. Civilian flying isn't military flying by any means, but the army can save some fifty flying hours training the C.A.A. graduates as against green men.

More spectacular and more important is the tripling of our factory personnel. Night schools have been running in many plants. In some plants, two men stand beside each machine—one a learner. This addition of 60,000 aircraft workers has tremendous military value. It is a popular notion that automobile mechanics can be switched to plane production overnight. Not so—the head of one of the nation's largest aircraft firms told me he would rather teach a green Kansas farmhand than try to unlearn an automobile worker.

The military significance of the doubling of our factory, field and pilot personnel is not simply that we can build, service and fly twice as many planes. The greater point is that our having gone through this expansion enables us to go through another quickly and efficiently. It provides us with the leaders and teachers for another doubling.

Modern war is really fought in the factories. Our plant expansion is as great a military surprise as Hitler's quick conquest of Poland. A year ago the army was wondering whether our factories could complete its 5,500-plane program on schedule. Now it appears many planes will be delivered ahead of time while the plants turn out thousands of war planes for the Allies, and half a dozen other nations, plus the greatest commercial orders in our industry's history.

Anyway, in 1938 we produced

Official U. S. Navy Photograph

Reported to be the fastest plane in the world, the Grumann Sky-Rocket *is known to have a speed of well over 400 M.P.H.*

$109,000,000 worth of aircraft, in 1939 around $225,000,000. This year the figure will be between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000. A year ago it was feared that the problem of producing engines of 1,000 or more horsepower would delay our defense program. Today we have plants built and building which by summer can turn out motors at a rate only Germany can exceed, and Germany's lead could be overtaken by putting our factories on a wartime basis.

Much of the plant expansion is in a sense a gift. For example, the French were so anxious to get engines from Wright and Pratt & Whitney that they advanced to each company the funds for new buildings and tools roughly doubling their engine production. Equally significant is the development of American liquid-cooled engines. For years, military planes in the United States have used Wright engines or Pratt & Whitney engines, both air-cooled. The Germans and British got ahead of us on liquid-cooled engines. We are now either catching up with them or going ahead, thanks to the great windowless plant of Allison (a General Motors outfit) at Indianapolis.

Last year Allison received a large army order for liquid-cooled engines. Some air-cooled enthusiasts grumbled and outsiders raised their eyebrows—until early February when the army let the public in on the secret that an Allison engine was giving our new pursuit plane (Bell's Airacobra) a speed of 400 miles an hour with a full military load. That's faster than any other American pursuit plane, faster perhaps than any in the world.

Further development of liquid-cooled motors may be expected if Congress listens to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The N.A.C.A. is the government-financed center for fundamental research. In some particulars its laboratory at Langley Field, Virginia, leads the world. But with Germany putting six times as much manpower as we put into fundamental research, the N.A.C.A. last year got Congress to provide a second laboratory which by summer will be operating at Sunnyvale, California, kicking up wind tunnel speeds with motors three times as powerful as Langley's. This year the N.A.C.A. is asking for a third laboratory—to concentrate on engines, particularly liquid-cooled and diesels. Meanwhile the engine makers themselves are putting large portions of their earnings into research.

Fortunately this added competition between motors and between plane builders comes just at the time when the plane manufacturers have extra profits to pour into experimental ships and when the army has extra funds for the same purpose. Earnings of aircraft builders in 1940 will be as much as gross sales in 1936.

Production, production capacity, earnings, competition, research—they are all increasing. Equally important, the industry is building up repeat business to keep plants humming after the army expansion program is completed and British-French war orders have ended. Simply to keep the army and navy squadrons at the new strength, our plants will have to turn out some 1,500 planes a year. Besides, there are other factors increasing demand for American planes and thereby increasing American air power. There's a boom in privately owned planes. Twice as many were built in 1939 as in 1938; sales are high again this year. Private planes are not war planes any more than your car is an army tank, but extra orders create more plants, more skilled workmen. They could turn out training planes which, for example, Britain, France and Canada all had to buy from us in their emergency.

The domestic airline boom is even more spectacular, in large part resulting from creation of magnificent safety records. Our domestic lines recently completed a year without a death or serious injury. This has brought twice as many passengers to the ticket windows. This year the airlines will probably fly a billion passenger miles—an increase of 50 per cent in two years. In the sky at any minute are 1,500 passengers.

Airmail and air express also increased. More feeder lines have been opened. Larger airports have been built, better schedules established. New customers are being produced as aviation goes home to hundreds of thousands more families—families of the enlarged army personnel, of the private flyers, of the students, the men in the new factories. All this spells more business for the aircraft industry which means more air power for Uncle Sam.

There's still another boom—in overseas flying. The Pan-American Clippers expect soon to fly the Atlantic each day every weekday. Pan-American plans to open a line to Alaska and to Australia—whereupon it will have planes shuttling Americans to every continent except Africa. And it lands passengers within ninety minutes air distance of Africa. Latin American travel is also booming. Pan-American is supplying our army and navy with invaluable data and our aircraft industry with important orders. American Export is trying to get a certificate for a second transatlantic line which would mean an initial order for three monster ships—and more to come. Commercially we are the most air-minded nation in the world. Britain's sea power resulted from her merchant marine

The assembly line of the Pratt and Whitney Aircraft Division of the United Aircraft Corporation, East Hartford, Conn. The motors on the line are twin Wasp engines, 1150 horsepower.

and we are repeating in the air.

The war has virtually eliminated foreign competition. Before the war American aircraft exports exceeded those of all other nations put together. We had double the exports of either Germany or Britain, our nearest competitors. In a few places Germany and Italy outsold us through barter agreements and long-term credit schemes—sometimes up to ten years. Italy, for instance, virtually gave Peru the nucleus of an air corps.

What was a clear lead has now been turned into a clear field. Our aircraft exports ranked sixth among all products last year, even before the war orders were being delivered.

American commercial planes are becoming standard equipment the world over. In South Africa recently German-built planes were grounded because of inability to get spare parts. Eight British planes were grounded in Uruguay for the same reason. In February the Argentine government suspended Buenos Aires-to-Montevideo cargo service until unsafe Italian planes could be replaced—another chance for American manufacturers. At work here are the same factors which gave American automobiles the world market—mass production, improved models, ubiquitous servicing. Most American manufacturers ask no more than to get their planes into a country, believing their quality will mean repeat orders.

What our planes, personnel and production facilities mean in air power depends upon our potential enemies. We are the only major power whose potential enemies all lie on the other side of an ocean. None has bombers with ranges equalling that of our Flying Fortresses—3,200 miles, which means a war radius (go, maneuver, bomb and return) of at least 1,200 miles. Hence, none can bomb the continental United States without first building bases near our boundaries—bases which our own bombers should be able to destroy before use. Or without resorting to such spectacular and non-profitable stunts as hit-and-run raids from carriers. At the moment the continental United States is safe from serious bombing; so are such strategic points as Pearl Harbor and the Canal.

Military men do not think in terms of the moment. Already we have planes in the blueprint stage which, from Hawaii, could bomb Tokyo and return—or Saarbrucken from an Atlantic base and return—though this is not to say any naval officer would send them on such missions.

If we can plan such ships, so can others. The Japanese are mere copyists, who buy prototypes (such as the mammoth DC-4) and are generally considered bright if they put the prototypes back together again. But the Germans—we don't know what they've designed. All we know is that we've beat them in ranges of planes in service mainly because they weren't interested in ranges. Their enemies were close at hand and so the German engineers concentrated on speed, got it—at the sacrifice of everything from crew comfort to maneuverability. But if after truce or victory the Germans should foresee a war with us they would naturally concentrate on range. Once they get into the air such planes as we have in our designing rooms (and they possibly in theirs) German planes could bomb our Atlantic ports from Horta in the Azores. And return. They could push into South America by way of the South Atlantic Narrows. They could trouble us in other directions—unless we have more and better planes than they.

Geography is on our side. Should ranges increase until transatlantic bombing is practical, all Germany could be within range of our bases, only eight of our eastern states in range of theirs. All Japan would lie under the threat of our Hawaiian and Alaskan bases without Japan being able to reach our Pacific shoreline. But geography is worthless without the air power to exploit it. Air power's personnel reservoirs and production facilities are impotent without the planes in service—the M-day forces—to meet and make the initial attacks.

The United States is on the verge of being the greatest air power in the world but it will not hold this supremacy unless we keep the expanded air fleets up to strength and up to date, once they are built. It may cost as much as it used to cost to run our whole navy. But it is the price of American air supremacy. Every other ingredient is a gift.

What Will America Do About Canada?

If the Allies lose the war—and even if they win—our relations with our northern neighbor may change

JOHN MacCORMAC

New York Times *correspondent, author of the new book,* Canada, America's Problem

For nearly a generation nothing has been heard from any responsible American statesman on the subject of annexation of Canada. Americans have realized that Canada is not a danger to them. It is recognized that Canada, which can defend itself so easily against assault from overseas, is helpless in the face of aggression from land.

Colonized Canada is a narrow band nowhere farther than 200 miles from the American frontier. Its communications could be cut, its spine could be broken, its cities could be bombed. The United States and Canada are so closely connected that such an attack would seem almost worse than civil war. If Canadian cities were bombed, a substantial part of the wealth destroyed would be lost by American investors. If Canada were annexed there would be an uproar from American farmers, who would find themselves unable to compete, and, since more than one thousand American firms already have branch plants in Canada, there would be no particular rejoicing among American manufacturers.

For these reasons, and because Americans are a friendly and generous if violent people, with no long memory for old hates and none of that half-mad, half-hysterical sense of racial mission that troubles the Germans, they have learned to ignore the Canadian border rather than resent it.

Certainly nothing could be more generous than America's treatment of Canada in this war. If our neutrality regulations had been drafted by Canadians, they could scarcely have been more accommodating. Canada can buy warplanes in the United States, though they must be pushed or towed, not flown, across the American border. Germany can't buy them. The ports of St. John and Yarmouth have been excepted from the belligerent zone which American ships may not enter. This has made it possible for American oil to be brought north by sea, both for Canadian consumption and for transfer to British ships which then proceed in convoy across the Atlantic. It has made it possible for Canada to trade in American ships with countries outside the belligerent zone. In other ways that it must remain for history to disclose the American authorities have accommodated themselves to situations created by Canada's belligerency.

That is the situation now. The question is what it will be when the war is over and whether new circumstances will alter the views of Americans. It is a subject on which official enlightenment cannot be expected. But the official mind, when it can be induced to speculate, seems to envisage three possible situations.

One of them would be produced by the decisive defeat of England and France. That would almost automatically result in Canada's independence under American auspices. Unlike the rest of the British Empire, Canada would be in no danger of falling prey to Germany or Russia unless the American fleet were destroyed. She would lose much of her importance in world affairs and fall irrevocably into America's orbit. But she would be safe while the United States was safe.

The second situation envisaged is that which would be produced should Britain emerge from a long, exhausting and indecisive war, not defeated but so weakened that she must decline to the status of a second-rate power. In such circumstances Canada might assume a larger importance in the British Empire but the Empire would have less importance in the world. Britain would no longer be able to dictate to Europe. Her crown colonies, as part of the price of peace, might be thrown open for general exploitation. The Empire would be replaced by the Commonwealth. In such a situation Canadian-American relations would remain on their present basis.

The third possibility is that Britain and France may win decisively but that Britain, as a result of war experience, may elect to base her Empire in the Western Hemisphere. Leaving the United Kingdom as a garrisoned outpost to command Europe's sea exits and entrances, she may pursue her imperial designs from Canada and thus continue her influence on the world.

It is freely admitted in Washington that this would create a new problem in Canadian-American relations. Only if British and American policies were closely co-ordinated would the American public, it is thought, view such a situation without alarm. Such close co-ordination would have to involve agreement among the English-speaking peoples about the sort of world they wanted and the methods which could be used to achieve it. Canada, it is admitted, could play the principal role in effecting such an integration if it were possible at all. She could never hope to rival the United States, either in resources or population, so that the wealthier and stronger she grew, the more important she would become as a hostage, the more convincing as a pledge of friendly be-

havior, the more influential in Empire councils.

But though this theoretical possibility is admitted there seems to be little informed belief in Washington that this is how matters will develop. Rather, Canada is seen to be pursuing a course that will sooner or later detach her from Great Britain. In this, official opinion seems to agree with the view that Canada must be left out of future imperial calculations.

MEANWHILE, Americans, far from disapproving, seemed pleased—one could say almost proud—when Canada threw in her lot with Britain in this war. This feeling exists strangely side by side with the passionately reiterated determination of Americans to stay aloof from the war themselves and a disposition to resent the British blockade and censorship as their impact is felt by the United States.

This paradox indicates how remarkably Canada, regarded for a century by Americans as the chief troubler of their relations with Great Britain, has changed her role. It also demonstrates how enduring is the damage done to British prestige in America by the course pursued by the Baldwin and Chamberlain governments. If there was a nation more execrated in the United States than Fascist Germany it was Bolshevist Russia. They have been twin devils in the American demonology. But the fact that they were hated failed to make their Allied enemies liked. Perhaps too many chronicles of cruelty and terror have blunted the moral world-sense of the American people, perhaps it is a defense mechanism against being drawn in, but there is a widespread tendency to consider this skeptically as merely an-

other in the long succession of European wars.

A corollary of this attitude is that the United States is taking steps to defend the isolation into which she has withdrawn. In an election year otherwise remarkable for economy in public spending, her fleet is being greatly enlarged, the ideal now being a navy big enough to protect both coasts without the assistance of the British fleet; there are larger military appropriations and new provisions for the defense, with the help of neighboring Latin-American nations, of the Panama Canal.

If the Allies manage to win this war by their own unaided efforts or hold their own long enough to effect some sort of compromise peace, it seems improbable that the United States will intervene. But if the Allies begin to lose the war, a totally new situation will be created. Intervention will cease to be a merely moral issue and will have to be considered, pro and con, on the basis of sheer self-interest. Can the United States afford to let Germany and Russia dominate the Old World?

Faced by the Italian conquest of Ethiopia and the imposition by Germany and Italy of a Fascist regime on Spain, England and France betrayed rather than championed the democratic principle. Old World democracy stultified itself by making terms with Fascism; Fascism by allying itself with Communism; Communism by allying itself with Fascism. But—however inadequate as judged by recent performances—in this struggle Britain and France are still the only representatives of individualism, capitalist democracy and world free trade. If they are beaten, these principles will be replaced in Europe, Asia, and Africa by totalitarianism and the sort of economic nationalism which, with the aid of barter agreements, quickly evolves into a new kind of economic imperialism.

Individualism, capitalist democracy and free trade are the three dimensions of the world the United States has lived and prospered in. They are almost what "Americanism" means. The United States has heavy material as well as political investments in such a world. What if she has granted no war credits to the Allies? She owns almost one and a half billion dollars' worth of British and French securities as compared with half a billion dollars' worth of German securities. If Britain and France lose the war it may be assumed that their securities will become about as collectible as the German ones.

The United States has $18,000,000,000 of gold, almost three-quarters of the world's total monetary supply. If Germany wins the war, gold will cease to be a medium of international exchange, for the Germans, who have had to finance their war preparations without it, will certainly see no reason to buy it with their goods after the war nor allow the Europe they will control to do so. Gold-dominated international finance is one of the things Germany says she is fighting against. In a world dominated by Germany America's eighteen billion dollars of gold might have very little value.

A MINOR point is that Great Britain is also the best customer of the United States. But if she lost her empire and fell under the heavy yoke of Germany, her purchases must decline. Germany, which has achieved at heavy cost a substantial measure of autarchy within her own narrow borders, would find it much easier to impose it on Europe, and why should she not do so? She would have the British colonies to draw on, with the

(Continued on page 60)

Keynoter Stassen

A young Minnesotan who has gone far in thirty-three years — and may go farther

WILLIAM H. KELTY

LAST December District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey spoke at Minneapolis, Minnesota, to open his campaign for President. Turning to the man who had introduced him, he said:

"Governor Stassen, I am sometimes accused of being young. I accuse you of being five years younger. Governor, I envy you your youthful vigor."

Two months later a second Republican aspirant, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, introduced by the same young man, said: "It is a good thing for divers and sundry Republican presidential candidates that there is a constitutional age limit at thirty-five."

Now the thirty-three-year-old Governor Stassen is to be temporary chairman and keynote speaker at the June Republican National Convention. In much less than two years he, the youngest governor in the nation, has been elected by the most overwhelming plurality ever given a candidate in Minnesota; he has worked with a sympathetic legislature to remodel the entire fabric of state government, and he is being talked about as a strong future possibility for President on the Republican ticket.

There must be something remarkable about a youngster who, within eleven years after his graduation from college, has climbed so high in a party alleged to be under "Old Guard" domination. In fact, there are several remarkable things about him. The first was his astonishing defeat of the Farmer-Labor party in 1938.

The people of Minnesota had begun to forget that they lived in a "normally Republican" state. The Farmer-Labor party took the governorship in 1930. Floyd B. Olson carried it to victory with his oratory, his personality, and his amazing ability to win friends from the enemy's camp.

Olson increased his plurality in the

Governor Stassen

election of 1932, and won again in 1934, but by 1936, when he had expected to go on to the Senate, he was dead. Elmer Benson was the Farmer-Labor nominee for Governor. That was a presidential election year, and the Democrats agreed that their candidates for Governor and Senator would be withdrawn in favor of the Farmer-Labor candidates if the Farmer-Labor party would back Roosevelt. The election was a headache for Republicans. Benson won with the heaviest plurality ever counted in a Minnesota election for Governor.

Elmer Benson's two years in office drew bitter criticism from Republicans, and popular opinion began to turn against the Farmer-Laborites. By 1938 the Republicans were sure that with the right candidate they could return to power.

Stassen, a young county attorney from a St. Paul suburb, beat two long-time party leaders for the Republican nomination. In his subsequent campaign for election he met people galore, greeting them with the handshake that has become famous for its cordiality. He pleased crowds by remembering perfectly the names of thousands of persons introduced to him. He made hundreds of speeches. And he was elected Governor by the greatest landslide in the State's history. He also carried the entire Republican state ticket into office with him, displacing several Farmer-Laborites of long incumbency. The legislature, elected on a non-partisan basis, was overwhelmingly conservative. Only one Farmer-Labor representative from Minnesota remained in Congress, and one Democrat, Harold Stassen's close friend and former law partner, Elmer J. Ryan. The seven other Representatives were all Republicans.

Stassen's father is a farmer of German, Czech and Scandinavian descent, his mother a native of Germany. Harold is nearly six feet three, weighs 215 pounds and has blond hair with a reddish tint. He worked on the farm as a boy, but was in high school at the age of eleven. Then he entered the University of Minnesota, and clerked in a store, and finally became a Pullman conductor on the Twin Cities-Chicago run to help pay his expenses.

Once out of law school he went into partnership with his classmate, Elmer J. Ryan, in South St. Paul. Harold campaigned for Ryan when the latter ran for Congress on the Democratic ticket; Elmer was the mainstay in Stassen's campaign for county attorney. At twenty-three the future Governor held his first public office.

As county attorney, Stassen began to display the liberal views that later made some older Republicans hesitant to back him for the Governorship. He was sympathetic toward labor. He served a group of dairy farmers without fee in their negotiations for higher milk prices. When he ran for re-election, his vote was a landslide.

Meanwhile he was entering state-

(Continued on page 59)

The Third Term

The arguments against it are marshalled by a Republican legislator from New England

STYLES BRIDGES

THE third term issue is before us. Against the pleas of leaders in his own party, against the advice of the vast majority of newspaper editors, business men and labor leaders, President Franklin D. Roosevelt has entered the lists for a third nomination.

He has permitted his name to be filed in primaries in a number of states, and delegates are now actually pledged to vote for his renomination. The question is no longer whether Mr. Roosevelt will run again. He is already running. He may withdraw before the Democratic convention. Meanwhile the issue is squarely before the country. And the country may as well make up its collective mind what it is going to do about it.

There is no constitutional provision against a third term for a President, however lamentably he may have failed to solve the problems that confronted him in his first and second terms. There is only custom. An old American tradition. Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, leading the third-term boosters, declares that the tradition against a third term for our Presidents is "political humbug." Yet the precedent for refusing nomination for a third term was established by George Washington, made positive and unmistakable by Thomas Jefferson, and followed by James Madison, James Monroe, Andrew Jackson, and many other horse-and-buggy Presidents.

Jefferson, true liberal that he was, feared the encroachment of a strong central government upon the rights of the people. He felt that tyranny would inevitably result from any single executive seeking unduly to hold power in a republic. He said:

"That I should lay down my charge at a proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. If some termination to the services of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally four

Senator Bridges

years, will, in fact, become for life, and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance. Believing that a representative government, responsible at short periods of election, is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle, and I should unwillingly be the person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond a second term of office."

But that's mere political humbug, according to Mr. Ickes and others on the third-term bandwagon.

This is not a partisan issue. Numerous resolutions have been passed in both Senate and House of Representatives, under various party leaderships, since 1803, expressing strong sentiment against any President seeking more than two terms or attempting to perpetuate himself in office, and calling for constitutional amendments to limit the presidential term. The Democratic Convention of 1896 resolved:

"We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of a hundred years, and sanctioned by the example of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and maintained our government, that no man should be eligible for a third term of the presidential office."

On June 10, 1901, President McKinley issued a statement, regretting that certain of his friends had begun to suggest that he would be "needed" for a third term: "There are new questions of the gravest importance before the administration and the country, and their just consideration should not be prejudiced in the public mind by even the suspicion of the thought of a third term."

Against the sage advice of unselfish and patriotic public leaders during the last century and a half of our national history, we find the movement for a third term for FDR well under way. Let us examine the sponsors. Who are backing this third-term blitzkrieg? Mr. Ickes declares—with a straight face—that Roosevelt's re-election is necessary "to save the recent gains made by democracy." He has been dashing here and there in strenuous efforts to f o r c e old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democrats to see the light. It is his job to convince them that the two-term tradition is an outgrown shibboleth.

Henry Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, Madame Perkins of Labor, Harry Hopkins of Commerce and Attorney-General Jackson have likewise given Cabinet support to the third-term draft. So also have such Senators as Guffey of Pennsylvania, Minton of Indiana and Pepper of Florida, stalwart New Dealers all.

Several leading ambassadors have come back home to rest and express their hope that Roosevelt will be kept in office. Political leaders of machine-ridden cities have joined the third-term chorus. And working feverishly behind the scenes, pulling the wires

and manipulating the primary contests, is what General Hugh S. Johnson calls "that vaudeville team of Corcoran and Cohen."

It was the determination of these New Dealers to brook no interference with their policies that led to the attempted "purge" in the 1938 primaries by which they hope to set up a Yes-man Congress, just as they had attempted to set up a Yes-man Supreme Court the year before. They are using the purge again—somewhat more cautiously and quietly. Ickes, Corcoran and associates are attempting to purge the Jeffersonian Democrats from the delegations to the Democratic National Convention by making sure that only ardent New Dealers and advocates of a third term for Mr. Roosevelt are selected as delegates. If any Jeffersonian Democrats slip through, the strategy calls for making them honorary delegates with no vote, and to invoke a unit rule at the convention by which, if they are in the minority of the state delegation, their votes will be lost.

WITH the administration record—which all these helped to write—staring the nation in the face, it is difficult to understand how these third-term enthusiasts can ask the country for four years more of it. But the third-term advocates well realize that, if FDR goes out, they go out with him. The pickings will not be so fat for the city political machines, the New Deal mouthpieces in Congress will lose their leadership, the appointees to high places will sink back to their level of obscurity and the vaudeville team will have to play on a different stage.

It is time to ask bluntly if the selfish interests of these and others who would profit by a third term—and a fourth, fifth and sixth—should outweigh the welfare of the nation.

There is little doubt that the President can have the New Deal nomination. These I have mentioned are in the forefront of a vast army of federal job holders, selected because of their political value in addition to any other qualifications they might possess. They are being called on now to make that political value negotiable. In addition, there are the millions who receive benefits in some form, supposedly because of the desire of the entire nation, regardless of politics, to lift levels and standards of social and economic life.

It is most objectionable that such high-minded motives should be utilized for political profit by any group. But such is the case.

Since 1933, we have invested the office of President of the United States with almost limitless authority. We have lodged such power in his hands as Washington and our other early Presidents never dreamed could be held by one man. With the enormous growth of government, we have given him virtual dictatorship over the activities of hundreds of thousands of officials. We have given him control over the granting and paying of subsidies running into billions of dollars annually. We have given him, through his subordinates, power to make rules and regulations which place definite controls upon business, manufacturing, transportation, labor, agriculture and every other activity engaged in by our 130,000,000 inhabitants.

Of course Franklin D. Roosevelt, with the power of his office and command of his party machinery, can secure the nomination for another term, and presumably another and still another. The question is whether he should do it.

No one who knows public affairs can dispute the fact that Mr. Roosevelt has used the power of his great office for full political effect. No one can doubt that should he be successful again he would drive his political advantage to the hilt.

It is time to consider solemnly just what another term for President Roosevelt would mean. The record of the last seven years speaks for itself. Programs for public betterment, with which all American people were in sympathy—higher incomes, greater security, better wages, higher living standards—have been subordinated in a mad desire to "make America over" with a pattern not American. The result has been loose spending, mounting debt, continued unemployment, industrial strife, business baiting and general defeatism.

Have we any assurance that four years more would be any better? On the contrary, we may rest assured that the same policies will be continued—with the same results. Not only will these policies be continued. They will be strengthened.

The argument is made that domestic conditions continue in a state of "emergency," and that this requires Roosevelt to remain in office. Much of FDR's popular strength has been based upon his continued cries of "emergency," and his third-term backers are well aware of that. He swept aside the pledges of his 1932 party platform, on the plea that an economic emergency existed. He set up the numerous New Deal agencies, demanded and secured powers once held by Congress, attempted to control the judiciary, and brushed aside historic constitutional bulwarks on the grounds of emergency. It is natural to expect that this man of straw would be dragged out to scare the people again.

All this in the face of the obvious fact that his theories have miserably failed to solve our domestic problems. One of the peculiarities of the New Deal mentality is inability to

(Continued on page 61)

Relief for Poland

How American funds and food are used to aid the needy in that unhappy country

MAJOR BENJAMIN T. ANUSKEWICZ

OUT of a total of approximately 14,000,000 people now in German-occupied Poland, known as the Gouvernment General, from 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 are suffering for want of food, medicine and clothing, and it is up to the United States to look after them. There is no one else to do the job.

Americans have taken over the feeding of Europe's distressed before. Between 1921 and 1923, as many as 10,000,000 children were fed daily in Central and Eastern Europe, including Russia. It is still easy to touch the American heart, but as hands go into pockets which are not as full as they were in the twenties, Americans are naturally asking how the relief that they are buying with their dollars is going to be administered. With headlines screaming "Blockade," "Occupation," "Siege," they are wondering how it is possible to get food to Poland from the United States.

Administering relief these days is a big job, one that has to be done because of—and in spite of—the fact that much of Europe is a raging battlefield. That is why, when the Commission for Polish Relief was formed last September, Colonel J. W. Krueger was selected as purchasing officer and assistant to the director of foreign operations. He had handled big relief jobs before, as assistant director in Paris of the Commission for Relief in Belgium and Northern France, as purchasing officer for the American Relief Administration and as executive director of the Puerto Rico Child Feeding Committee. For his war services and his children's relief activities, he was decorated by the French and Belgian Governments.

In this present Polish relief effort, it was necessary, in the first place, to decide what kind of food to buy for the starving people. There were three main considerations. The food must be nourishing, it must be economical

MAJOR BENJAMIN T. ANUSKEWICZ, President of the New York State Reserve Officers Association and Vice-Chairman of Paderewski Fund for Polish Relief, is a graduate of the United States Army Chemical Warfare School.

and it must be some kind with which the recipients are familiar.

A volunteer advisory Committee on Nutrition to the Commission for Polish Relief was formed, with such experts as Prof. E. V. McCollum of the American Institute of Nutrition, Johns Hopkins University, and Dr. Hazel Stiebeling, of the Bureau of Home Economics, Department of Agriculture. It met with the Commission and gave its recommendations for an economical, life-sustaining diet, which would also be protective, especially for women and children. While fulfilling these requirements, it had to be modified in many instances by conditions of life in Poland, and present shipping and purchasing problems.

Julien Bryan Photo

Where Now?

For example, beans are cheap and nourishing but, because fuel is scarce in Poland and the cooking time for beans is lengthy, they could not be included in the food program.

Some other well-known American food products, such as peanut butter, which is low-priced and nourishing, could not be accepted for a different reason. They are unknown in Poland and the Poles would have difficulty in becoming accustomed to them.

The final selection of foodstuffs to be sent to Poland was generally determined by surpluses in the American market. Foods which fulfilled the other requirements and the purchase of which would relieve the American farmer and business man from the evils of an over-supply were the ones which the Commission wished to buy. The three recent shipments which left America contained altogether 595,152 tins of evaporated milk (for children), 1,260,140 pounds of rye flour, 89,992 pounds of lard, 181,005 pounds of vegetable fats, 716,430 pounds of hominy grits and 90,000 pounds of sugar. The total tonnage was 1,528 and it is estimated that 131 10-ton cars are needed for its rail transportation across Europe from Genoa, Italy.

Although to the average well-fed American this menu may seem to leave a great deal to be desired, it must be remembered that, at the present time, the Commission is attempting to aid mass feeding through the communal kitchens, of which there are several hundred in each of the large cities. These kitchens are operated by local Polish and Jewish Committees, but their supplies are running low and they require additional foodstuffs to continue.

Once the Commission decided what

to buy, the next thing was to decide where to buy it. The Commission interviewed some of the largest manufacturers and producers of food supplies in the country and, because of the charitable purpose for which their products were intended, succeeded in getting special prices in many cases.

All the food is bought F.A.S. (Freight Alongside Steamer), New York City, so there is no storage problem. It arrives just in time to be loaded. Neither is there any packing problem, for all the goods are bought packed especially for export.

THE Commission hopes eventually to charter boats to carry its cargo exclusively, which would mean that food for Poland could be transported at a much lower rate, and with less interference and transshipment. At present, the cargo goes wherever space can be found. Here, however, as in the purchasing of food, the charitable nature of the work enables the Commission to obtain reductions in ocean freight and railroad rates abroad and to get other concessions in the matter of space. The Italian steamship lines have been especially accommodating.

Steamship freight costs have increased 25 per cent since May 1 in the Mediterranean. Still, the average cost of a ton of food delivered in Warsaw is approximately $100. This includes rehandling and reconsigning charges en route and insurance. The first shipment left New York April 20 on the *S.S. Manhattan* of the United States Lines and arrived in Genoa the first of May. Two more shipments left early in May, one aboard the *S.S. Washington* of the United States Lines and the other aboard the *S.S. Giulia* of the Italian Lines. The reason for the split shipment was the abnormal shipping situation, with Mediterranean boats filled with European freight.

Once the cargo leaves New York, its handling is a matter of international diplomacy. The Commission has representatives in Berlin and in a number of other European cities, who aid in negotiations with various governments and in handling the shipments. The representative in charge is Hugh Gibson, formerly Minister to Poland. These agents have helped to make relief to Poland possible by securing special concessions from foreign governments.

Julien Bryan Photo

This was once Warsaw.

The Allies permit the passage through the blockade of food for Poland's starving millions on one condition, i.e., that American representatives supervise the shipments until they are finally distributed, so that they will not be used for any other purpose than the relief of the most needy Poles and Jews.

The German Government permits the Polish Commission to fulfill this function. Convoyers are allowed to ride with the shipments through Germany, and the Commission's representatives have permission to enter the occupied territory and supervise the distribution of food in cooperation with the German Red Cross and the local Polish and Jewish Committees. These men have had much practical field experience in relief work. They helped feed the starving Russians and Belgians and they know how to see that food gets to those Polish people who need it most, regardless of race or creed.

As each of the Commission's cargoes arrives in Genoa, it is met by Mr. Randolph Wilson, the Port Officer, who has charge of reshipment via Italy and Germany. He sees that it is transferred to Italian trains, where, accompanied by an agent in accordance with the Commission's agreement with the British Government, it is shipped to Germany. As a special concession, the Italian Government carries it at half the usual rail rates. Reloaded on the German railroads, it travels free of charge by arrangement with the German Government, with necessary protection through to Warsaw.

Americans naturally wonder what conditions in Poland actually are. The answer has been in the news, but the news is so complex these days that it takes an expert in international affairs to interpret it. A few figures from the report of Baron de Ropp, Commissioner of the Polish Pavilion at the World's Fair, will help Americans to understand why the Poles cannot help themselves.

The Gouvernment General, which is the part of Poland left for the Poles, held about 11,000,000 of the pre-war 35,000,000 inhabitants of Poland. Today, 13,500,000 people have been crowded into this area, despite the fact that it was formerly Poland's political and business center and without its productive hinterland, which has been annexed by Germany, offers these people no means of making a living. Deportation from parts of Poland annexed by Germany has been principally responsible for swelling the numbers in the Gouvernment General. By January of this year about 1,200,000 people had been deported from the five annexed provinces into the Gouvernment General, the proportion of women and children being very high.

In the Gouvernment General, it is estimated that 2,000,000 deportees, in addition to an urban population

(Continued on page 59)

What's YOUR Opinion?

A monthly department conducted by George V. Denny, Jr., founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air and President of Town Hall, New York

The Question this month:

WHOM SHOULD THE G. O. P. NOMINATE—AND WHY?

Answers by: RUSSELL W. DAVENPORT, ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT, ROY O. WOODRUFF, FRANK A. VANDERLIP, JR., AND KENDALL HOYT

THERE is little disagreement among well informed people that the 1940 election will be the most important one we have had in this country since the Civil War. Each day the war in Europe comes closer to our shores. Living rooms, dining rooms and clubs all over America reverberate with news of a war more ruthless and efficient than any other history has known. Headlines shriek of the horrors of war three thousand miles away, while our own problems of unemployment, labor relations, crop control and the national debt sink into the background.

The unsolved problems of the past hundred and fifty years are converging upon this period of history for solution, and it seems probable that the next four years will be as important to modern civilization as any period during the next century. If we cannot find the right answer to these problems through democratic processes, our democracy will go the way other democracies have gone.

Almost superhuman capacities for leadership will be required of the President of the United States during the next four years. It is pertinent, then, that CURRENT HISTORY should give its readers all possible information concerning potential candidates and issues in the coming campaign, and it is of the most urgent necessity that every citizen do his part in helping America to find the right answers in this crisis.

This month we have asked supporters of the most prominently mentioned candidates for the Republican presidential nomination to state their views on the subject, "Who Should be Nominated by the Republican Party—and Why?" We present these statements just as they have been given to us, without comment.

Next month it is our hope to present statements on behalf of Democratic potentialities, unless President Roosevelt indicates his intention to run for a third term, in which case it is assumed that, in view of the statements made by Democratic contenders, there will be no opposition to him at the Democratic national convention in July.

Herewith, Russell W. Davenport, who resigned as managing editor of Fortune, *the monthly magazine, to campaign for his favorite candidate, explains why he advocates the nomination of*

Wendell L. Willkie

"During the past several years those who follow national affairs closely have been treated to a new experience. They have seen rising out of American business a man whose talent for industrial management is matched by his political sagacity.

"When Wendell L. Willkie converted Commonwealth & Southern's net loss of $1,600,000 in 1934 to a net profit of $10,600,000 in 1937, the business community was—to use one of Mr. Willkie's pet phrases—'highly gratified.' When, with his daring 'objective rate,' he managed to slash the cost of electricity to consumers, giving Commonwealth the lowest average rate and the highest average domestic consumption of any major utility in the land, the business community recognized him as one of the country's leading industrialists. Better than any other man in his field, he had understood and carried out that most basic of industrial precepts—to give more for less.

"But when Mr. Willkie crashed head on into the New Deal, a different note was sounded. The President of Commonwealth & Southern had the strange theory that, if he could carry his business fight to the people, he would win it. The issue he raised was not public ownership of power, as such, but the right of private enterprise to do business without unfair competition from the government. It was a political issue and he won it.

"Even at that early date—beginning in 1937 and lasting into the summer of 1939—there were those who remarked of Mr. Willkie that he was presidential timber. Certainly, in his devotion to the fundamental concepts of American government, and his willingness to debate them against all comers, he had built an impregnable political platform upon which to stand. Invitations to speak and invitations to write articles began pouring across his desk. He accepted a few of the speeches: most of the articles. He was heard and read from coast to coast.

"In the course of what he calls 'spreading my ideas' he has now come to the attention of millions of persons, and of every political figure of importance in the country. Much pressure has been put upon him to step out for the Republican nomination for the presidency. But he has resisted this. While stating frankly that he would accept the nomination if it were offered to him, he has re-

fused to organize politically, to seek delegates or to raise funds.

"For my part I am satisfied that Mr. Willkie should be offered the nomination that he says he would accept: first, because he would have the best chance of winning against the present Administration in the coming election fight; and secondly, because he would make the best President of any man in the field, in either party.

"He alone can match political wits with Mr. Roosevelt. And he can also match personality. Mr. Willkie has great charm, which even his enemies acknowledge. He has the ability to win the loyalty of those who work with him and to stir the imagination of the public. He never fails to win his audiences—and sometimes they stand right up in their chairs.

"As for his presidential qualifications, it is obvious that what we need most in government today is a knowledge and understanding of American enterprise. This is just as important from the point of view of foreign policy as from that of domestic recovery. The people ought to put some good business brains to work for them: a man who understands the meaning of *profit*, and who will see to it that the people profit, in terms of opportunity as well as of dollars.

"We need Mr. Willkie for prosperity. And if it is true that we are faced with a great crisis, we need him even more. For he has the capacity to become the Abraham Lincoln of our time."

To Arthur T. Vanderbilt, distinguished member of the New Jersey bar, and formerly president of the American Bar Association, it seems clear that the Republican nomination should go to a young District Attorney whose achievements are nationally famous,

Thomas E. Dewey

"Thomas E. Dewey is a campaigner of extraordinary ability, an administrator of capacity and resource, a clear thinker and a courageous performer. His public addresses show that he understands the gravity of the great questions which confront the American people and will apply sound, constructive methods for their solution. He strikes out forcibly and directly. The country will always know where he stands.

"As a President, Dewey will be bound only by a deep respect for the

Constitution, a devotion to the traditions of his country and a profound love for personal and human freedom. He can begin with a clean slate and map out his administration plans solely for the best interests of the country. His speeches have been sufficiently broad to give him flexibility in approaching federal problems and issues, yet they have been sufficiently concrete to make it clear that his methods will be tested rather than experimental, forthright rather than tricky, broadly constructive for the country rather than designed for momentary political advantage.

"We speak frequently, perhaps at times unthinkingly, about a man being a good vote-getter. Sometimes there is an implication that a good vote-getter always says exactly what the people want to hear at the moment. But nothing is clearer in the course of American politics than that the people are attracted by a man of firm and unswerving conviction, who is willing to stand on the true course against temporary squalls and eddies of mistaken opinion.

"Throughout Dewey's public career he has stood steadily to the course chartered when he took the helm. As a result he has always delivered the cargo at the destination exactly as he promised to do. Certainly in his service as special prosecutor and as District Attorney in New York—jobs of outstanding importance to millions of our citizens—he has written one of the most brilliant records of achievement and public service in recent times.

"While I have no desire to enter into comparisons, I feel that Tom Dewey is the only outstanding candidate for the Republican nomination who has had public administrative experience. Those who have followed his career know what an able administrator he has proved himself to be. Experience as an administrator is important for any presidential candidate. As Chief Assistant United States Attorney, and subsequently as United States Attorney, he supervised most effectively as administrative head the federal government's largest prosecuting office. All are familiar with the efficient manner in which as District Attorney he now conducts one of the largest public legal offices in the country. One of the reasons for his success is that he selects able assistants and gives them the responsibility and credit for their accomplishments. We may be sure that he would appoint cabinet officers of outstanding ability and would restore teamwork to the federal government.

"Dewey, when elected, will end the useless, continuous harassment of American business by government, and that in my opinion is a prerequisite to industrial recovery and reemployment in this country. Dewey has made it clear that he favors the system of private enterprise and finds no inherent cause for hostility between government and business. Moreover, he has taken the position that the huge task of restoring employment to the millions of Americans still out of work must be carried on by private enterprise and that permanent jobs cannot be created by Washington planners using public money.

"While Dewey will encourage and assist legitimate business, he will not tolerate business abuses. I like the pointed manner in which he has called upon the New Deal administration to quit using American business as a scapegoat:

" 'Stop making vague, unfounded charges against American business men. If any business man violates the

law, name him, indict him, convict him, fine him, jail him. But stop bringing the whole of the group into disrepute and discouragement.'

"Just as Dewey has promised fair treatment for business, he has promised sympathetic, constructive policies for American agriculture. The candor with which he has treated the farm problem has won him acclaim throughout the agricultural states. He has left no doubt about his international position and has reiterated his emphasis that we must send no Americans to die on the battlefields of Europe.

"Tom Dewey's appeal to the people is evident from the support he has received in the primary states and from the strong editorial endorsement of the newspapers over the country. It is evident from the great crowds that have turned out to greet him at all stages in his campaign. The Gallup poll reported on May 8 showed him to be the choice of 67 per cent of those who voted for the Republican ticket in 1936. The Republican party can be confident of success in November with Tom Dewey as its nominee."

Kendall Hoyt, conservative commentator, Washington correspondent of The Annalist *and other publications, and long a Republican worker, explains why he believes the nomination should be awarded to*

Robert A. Taft

"The breakdown of Europe has set exacting standards for the next President. He must qualify in the field of foreign affairs. He must be determined to keep us out of war. He must have a thorough grasp of the domestic problems which must be solved to put a hundred-billion-dollar country behind a ten-billion-dollar government for our defense against war.

"Robert A. Taft is experienced in economic preparedness. During the World War, twice rejected for active service because of poor eyesight, he was a principal aide in the Food Administration, in the center of our wartime effort.

"After the Armistice, he was counsel of the American Relief Administration in Europe. Taft organized relief services in war-torn countries, helped negotiate the Finnish loan, and served as Hoover's aide in the meetings of the Inter-Allied Council, working toward the reorganization of Europe's industry and finances.

"He has seen what it takes to fight a war and knows the tragic consequences of going in. Months before the present conflict, he advocated the repeal of the arms embargo to help the weaker nations against the stronger; he insisted on a cash-and-carry policy to keep our ships and money from being involved—the main points of the policy later adopted by the Administration.

"In the domestic field, Taft's experience as a lawyer extends over a wide range of American business. Two years in the Senate have been enough to demonstrate his grasp of national problems. From the beginning, he has been a leader, taking a firm position on each issue without waiting to see what other leaders would do and without seeking a politically 'safe' course.

George V. Denny, Jr.

"Taft has the psychology of a strong man. A six-footer, he is one of the most highly educated men in the country. He led his class at Yale and Harvard Law. His success has come from the working of a completely logical mind, backed by great reserves of physical energy.

"The Taft tradition is one of high public service by great administrators. In Ohio, Robert Taft, by sheer ability and hard work, became Speaker of the Legislature and later a member of the State Senate. He revised the chaotic tax system of Ohio into an orderly plan which has served as a model for other states. He backed progressive labor legislation long before the New Deal.

"It was his straight thinking on national problems, together with a genius for organization and leadership, that sent him to the Senate. What impressed the voters most was his full sincerity and integrity which led people instantly to trust him.

"In the Senate, in radio debates, and in hundreds of speeches in all parts of the country, he has set forth a complete Republican program. He hopes that the campaign will not be fought on differences in foreign policy. It is the domestic policy that has left nine millions unemployed, failed to give the farmer real parity, and kept the country in depression.

"It is the domestic policy, Taft warns, which may leave us weak and unprepared against attack.

"Senator Taft believes that our economic system can be made to work if allowed to work; that bureaucratic regulation and expense is choking initiative. He believes that government encouragement of social and economic progress is liberal; that government control is illiberal.

"Taft has given the Republicans a full-scale plan not merely to attack but to replace the present Administration. They are turning to him because, month by month, he has shown the courage, the force, and the ability to assert leadership toward national security, based on old concepts of constitutional government which are the antithesis of the New Deal. The belief has grown in both parties that the country will be safe in his hands."

In the opinion of Roy O. Woodruff, prominent member of Congress from Michigan, the logical Republican nominee is the senior Senator from that state.

Arthur H. Vandenberg

"1. Arthur Vandenberg has the universal respect, the confidence and the friendship of the members of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives. By reason of this, he would be able, as President, to secure the cooperation of the Senate, which cannot possibly be controlled by the Republicans in the next Administration.

"2. Senator Vandenberg has the experience, the statesmanship and the courage to perfect all the New Deal measures which are worthy of being retained, and to abolish all which are inimical to the welfare of the nation.

"3. Senator Vandenberg has declared that he would serve but one

term as President. Therefore, not being interested in a second term, he could be depended upon to give a fearless administration.

"America is at the crossroads. Upon the outcome of the elections, and the people's choice of a President of the United States, will depend whether or not we shall be able to save our sound, solvent Constitutional Republic; whether we shall regain prosperity in the American way, or whether we shall continue toward further concentration of power in the Executive Department, a course which inevitably, must lead to a political autocracy, if not dictatorship.

"The Republican Presidential nominee should be a leader capable of leading the way back from the adventurous trails of New Dealism to the firm, sound ground of free constitutional government and administration. It is clear to any student of affairs that Michigan's senior Senator, Arthur H. Vandenberg, more than any other single man in public life today, has helped to keep Republicanism vibrant and alive throughout the recent years of its dark despair.

"I think Arthur H. Vandenberg has himself stated the best reasons why he should be chosen by the Republican convention as the party's presidential nominee. He said:

" 'The next Republican national convention must first set down clean-cut, constructive, courageous principles which dependably promise to save the American system of free enterprise under the renewed spirit of constitutional democracy, and to recapture prosperity for our whole people under a government restored to solvency.

" 'In my view, it must strive to create common ground upon which all like thinkers may unite to produce an administration for all Americans in which a pre-pledged, one-term President is manifestly free from all incentive but the one job of saving America.

" 'It would be wholly out of character for me personally to pursue the nomination for myself. It is for the people themselves to speak. No man understanding its difficulties and responsibilities could covet the Presidency; and no American could decline it if chosen.'

"Those are the best reasons that could be found for the Republican convention to make Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, the presidential nominee to lead the ticket to victory."

Frank A. Vanderlip, Jr., banker, treasurer of the Gannett-for-President National Committee, son of the late Frank Vanderlip, who was president of the National City Bank of New York, is convinced that the ideal nominee for the Republican party is a nationally known newspaperman,

Frank Gannett

"The Republican Party must have a candidate who not only can be elected but after election can succeed as President. Its candidate must be a hard-hitting, effective campaigner; after his election he faces a task of reconstruction.

"That task requires an experienced executive who works well with people and under whom subordinate officials will give their best efforts. It requires a realist and not a theorist, an economizer and not a spender, a harmonizer who is not an opportunist.

"That man must possess enlightened social responsibility, unquestioned devotion to constitutional principles and firm belief in the system of free enterprise. He must have determination to keep this country a peaceful, prosperous democracy. To assist in restoring peace abroad and prosperity at home he must have knowledge of world problems.

"In Frank Gannett, the Republican Party would have a candidate who can be elected. He has already demonstrated that he could retire the New Deal from office. During the last three years, without party organization or prestige of public office, he played a decisive part in four major defeats of the New Deal. He led the mass revolt against court packing.

"Leaders of agriculture have known and worked with Gannett intimately for years. He has been a frequent speaker at annual conventions of the Grange, the Farm Bureau and the National Cooperative Council. Republican leadership is not unaware of the task the party faces in winning back the farm vote. Gannett is the only candidate who has a farm policy that would restore to the farmer his normal income and purchasing power which would enable revived industry once again to give full employment.

"Frank Gannett is a product of the American way. He was born on an upstate New York farm. His early life was one of ambitious struggle. He made his own way from the age of nine, worked his way through college, and through character, vision, independence and executive ability built up the third largest newspaper chain in the United States.

"To an extravagant, debt-ridden inefficiently operated Federal Government, he can bring the talents of a seasoned and successful executive. He met the test of the depression by operating all of his newspaper properties in the black. He secured their economical operation not by dictatorial methods but by fostering efficient administrative teamwork and properly delegated responsibility. Frank Gannett would bring sound business principles to the biggest business on earth—the United States Government.

"Gannett's career as an editor and publisher has demanded a knowledge and understanding of public affairs and domestic and foreign problems beyond the mere business conduct of newspapers. He has been in the forefront of studying, formulating and clarifying issues which affect the American people. Extensive travel in Europe and South America have kept him abreast of current political, social and economic problems. He has the knowledge to lead America through the economic adjustments which must follow the present war.

"In no other candidate on the Republican side are combined the proven executive capacity, the matured understanding of national and international problems, the enlightened labor record, the popularity among farmers, the fearlessness in formulating and clarifying issues and the hard-hitting campaigning ability possessed by Frank Gannett. If nominated, he would be elected, and his election would rebuild America."

THEY SAY

Quotations from the World Press

Wendell Willkie

—Because, in recent weeks, the Willkie-for-President boom has spread far and wide, because many wish to know what manner of man this is who is so often proposed as the Republican nominee, CURRENT HISTORY *reprints, in condensed form, the article on Mr. Willkie by Gordon Hamilton, which appeared in the February issue*

Wendell Willkie, only business man now being boomed for the highest office in the United States, used to be a Democrat. But at present, he said to me recently, "I think I am enrolled in the Republican party."

However, he does not want to be branded as Republican or Democrat, New Dealer or anti-New Dealer: "My political philosophy agrees with neither that of the New Deal nor that of the Republican party, as advanced by their leaders. I will not be a liar."

Such insistence on party irregularity might seem an unpromising route toward the Presidency. But that doesn't bother the stubbornly individualistic Willkie. And although he is making no formal campaign for the Presidential nomination, he does not repeat the customary coy political cliches about not being a candidate.

Willkie's position as President of the Commonwealth and Southern, pays $75,000 a year, the same salary received by the President of the United States. That is not considered a high wage for the president of a billion-dollar corporation, and income taxes bite out one-third of it. When he was offered the post of Chairman of the Board of Directors as well, he abolished the job as "too damn stuffy. I would have to be dignified."

"It's an asset in my business," he insists, "to look like an Indiana farmer." Careless in dress, he doesn't bother to look prosperous, doesn't bother to comb his mop of greying hair out of his keen eyes, to wear a starched collar, to keep his clothes pressed, or to buy a new suit before the old one is shiny in the seat.

When he sits, his feet throw themselves over the arm of his chair. When he stands, "I stoop a little now" (six-feet one-inch tall, he weighs 210 pounds). He paces up and down, up and down his office, uttering his opinions with a Midwestern accent and in a booming voice that is always ready for a hot argument—the hotter the better. When he smokes, the match falls to the carpet, followed by a trail of ashes.

Willkie is something of a scholar, specializing in research on Southern economics before the Civil War. When the nation's book publishers besieged him for a volume on his political opinions, he suggested that he might consent to write about the old South.

"Just a clutter of books," he calls his relatively modest seven-room apartment on upper Fifth Avenue, New York City, across the street from the Metropolitan Museum of Art. To go to his office on the 21st floor of the Chase National Bank building, one block north of Wall Street, he takes the subway if he is in a hurry, otherwise a taxi. He has never owned an automobile. "I'm scared to drive a car," he explains, "because I am absent-minded. I'm afraid I would run up a telephone pole."

Besides reading, he fishes and plays a little poker for relaxation. Once a month if possible, he "fusses around" the five farms he owns in Rush County, Indiana, No. 1 corn-hog county in America. He raises corn, feeds it to 1,000 hogs, says he makes "a little money" at farming.

A native Indianan, he was born 48 years ago in Elwood, a manufacturing boom-town until the exhaustion of its natural gas wells, once so rich that it was cheaper to let the street lights burn all day than hire a man to turn them on and off.

His grandparents had fled here after Germany's liberal revolution of 1848 fizzled. His grandmother was a Presbyterian teacher, although Wendell himself is Episcopalian.

Wendell's father and mother were both school teachers and lawyers—his mother was the first woman admitted to the Indiana bar. Wendell was one of six children.

Willkie was sent to Culver Military Academy, then to the University of Indiana. At college he became known as a red-sweatered campus radical spreading socialistic ideas, including the abolition of all inheritance as unfair to persons who inherit nothing. He raged against fraternities until his senior year, when he joined glamour boy Paul V. McNutt in Beta Theta Pi. He fumed against the law faculty, but got his A.B. in 1913, his LL.B. in 1916. Meanwhile he was helping to pay for his education by moving houses from Elwood, by then a ghost town, out to neighboring farms, by harvesting grain from the Dakotas to Oklahoma, by barking for a tent hotel during a land rush at Aberdeen, S. D.

After his graduation from law school, he joined his father's legal practice. In the first case he helped prepare the Willkies won the dissolution of an injunction which had forbidden a labor union to picket. He recalls the incident: "You can earmark me as a man who has no prejudice against the rights of labor. I believe in collective bargaining, and I'm against any business run the paternalistic way, where employees are supposed to be seen and not heard." Today Commonwealth and Southern's operating subsidiaries are two-thirds unionized, having contracts with both C.I.O. and A.F. of L.

Wendell's budding law practice was cut short when America entered the World War. To fight the same German autocracy which his grandparents had fought before him, he enlisted on the first day, was sent to officers' training camp. While there he found time to say to Edith Wilk-

secretary of the town library trustees: "Edith, I'd like to change that Wilk to Willkie." A blizzard delayed the wedding two days, until Wendell arrived with a frozen bouquet, which Edith carried to the church. They have one child, 20-year-old Philip, a senior at Princeton. He intends to study at Harvard Law School next year.

The most lasting effect the army had on Willkie was to change his name. He had enlisted as Lewis Wendell Willkie. The army transposed his first and middle names, advised: "By the time we get them corrected through all the red tape of Washington, the war will be over." So that time Willkie did not challenge the government.

In 1918 he was sent to France with the 325 Field Artillery. He lingered abroad after the Armistice to defend soldiers in court-martials.

Then he joined the legal department of Firestone in Akron, quit to take a job with the law partnership of Mather and Nesbitt. As delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1924, he fought for the nomination of Al Smith over William Gibbs McAdoo, because McAdoo was backed by the Ku Klux Klan. But politics were a minor matter in his life. Making a brilliant record as a lawyer, he attracted the attention of B. C. Cobb, later President of Commonwealth and Southern.

In 1929 Cobb hired him away to become the counsel for C. & S. When Cobb retired on New Year's Day in 1933, at the lowest depth of the depression, he left Willkie as president.

Willkie immediately set about making the best record of any utility executive in the country. Holding the string to a billion dollars in assets scattered over eleven states between the Appalachians and the Mississippi, he doubled the average domestic use of electricity in his territory until it topped the record of any other major utility system, and cut the domestic rates in half until they were the lowest in the country.

But in his Tennessee properties he collided head on with the New Deal. The battle that resulted between the government-owned Tennessee Valley Authority and Willkie's Commonwealth and Southern became the most spectacular government-versus-business feud of the past seven years. It finally ended in compromise last summer, when the TVA paid C. & S. $78,600,000 for its Tennessee properties.

Fitzpatrick, The St Louis Post Dispatch

Finished a Lot of Things Last Time.

It was ironical that in the TVA fight Willkie became the spokesman for conservative business forces in their resistance to the New Deal, because Willkie has always boasted of being a "La Follette liberal." He was proud to "shock my Tory friends" by demanding regulation of the utility companies by the Federal government. "I admired the elder La Follette and the elder Roosevelt," he admits, "for their fight against the domination of the legislature, the courts and the people by big business. Today there is the same struggle—against domination of the legislature, the courts and the people by big government."

When the revolt against the abuses of big business burst forth in the 1932 election, Willkie supported Franklin D. Roosevelt, contributed $150 to his campaign chest—although he later publicly regretted: "I wish I had it back." Though he voted against Roosevelt in 1936 in favor of Alf M. Landon, he became no more a Republican in spirit than he had been a Democrat, no more an Old Dealer than he had been a New Dealer: To him "The greatest joy in life is to keep one's thoughts uncontrolled by formulas. I won't be dropped into a mold. I want to be a free spirit. If I wasn't one, I would be still sitting on a cracker box in Indiana."

If the Allies Lose — What of the U. S.?

—Condensed from a recent speech before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States by Lewis W. Douglas, president of the Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York and former Director of the Budget

In certain parts of the world, there have developed firmly held views incompatible with standards of peaceful international behavior. Peoples'

minds have become fastened to rules of human conduct resting on the opinion that force makes right. For the freedom of the individual, there has been substituted among these nations the ruthless power of the state.

Personal rights, the cornerstone of essential unit in society. From them our cultural ideas spring. They have been modified here by something that is typically American, but the modifications have been more in form than in substance.

Some may say that they, too, in the past have failed to observe the in-

Middleton, The Birmingham Gazette

The American watchdog still wags his tail, but it's the other end that bites.

civilization west of the Rhine, have been revoked, repudiated, subordinated to organized violence. Democracy has been renounced. Minorities have been suppressed, races have been incarcerated and, in some instances, the worship of God has been prohibited.

Business enterprise, the church, those who labor with their hands, and work with their minds, those who write and those who speak—even those who teach—have been brought under the arbitrary commands of personal government They have been summoned before secret tribunals and have been judged by the cold barbaric standard of whether their opinions were consistent with a philosophy of fear and hate.

Force of a rare kind in human experience—brutal, savage—observing no moral standards which we would accept, has been and is the instrument of their foreign policy. Innocent neutral countries inhabited by simple, kindly, gentle people have, one by one, been violated, invaded and acquired by the relentless use of armed might.

Pitted against this code of international behavior are peoples that traditionally have cherished, in substance, the way of living that we cherish. They value the same general kind of political, social and moral ideals. They attach significance to the individual as a dignified and tegrity of contracts and at times have resorted to aggression as an instrument of national power. But is any act they have committed comparable in its ruthlessness to the acts of those who, in our own time, worship force, who rivet their future and the future of the world to the arbitrament of might?

As between those who still cherish a belief in reason as the judge of human actions and those who believe in might as the measure of right, can we be indifferent?

Can we say that it makes no difference to our future, to our vital national interests who wins this conflict? Can we be acquiescent to a victory by a personal government that uses the "threshing-rods" and that has trodden out freedom of the inquiring mind, liberty of speech, privilege of assembly, and the right to worship according to one's conscience? Can we retain the substance of our way of living, weakened in a world dominated by force?

There are some who may hold the opinion that we can isolate ourselves from world events, crawl into our economic and political cyclone cellar, and thus preserve the essential elements of the American experiment But this means ultimately the creation of a government here vested with sufficient arbitrary powers to restrict our production to our internal demands, to plan our consumption so that it meets our production and thus to distribute whatever products we may cultivate or manufacture by the standards of a central planning authority, dispensing favors here, subsidizing efforts there, directing the production of synthetic articles which can be obtained elsewhere in the world for less, expending an ever increasing part of our production and our patrimony in a necessarily expanding system of national defense.

To retreat to the cyclone cellar here means, ultimately, to establish a totalitarian state at home.

What would be our position in the world if the English and French way of living is distorted, even obliterated, by the lash of force? What would be our position in a world dominated by a few men who worship might, who use the totalitarian technique in world markets, who canalize their trade through governmental monopolies, who manipulate currencies and prices to suit the ambitions of the state, who recognize no promise given, who abide by no commitment made, who ignore all the simple precepts of civilized living, who organize the efforts of their fellows and the activities of their countries for the purposes of national military power?

Must we not, under these circumstances, resort in self-defense to the same devices in more temperate and more human form? Must not we organize our national wealth, dispose of our human resources, orient our instruments of production for defense against forces of aggression that we alone and unaided may, in the future, be called on to resist? Will we not then be pushed into the same type of authoritarian life so repugnant to the ideals of our country?

On either horn of the dilemma, absolute isolation on the one hand, or living in a world dominated by force instead of by reason, our national interest will be affected in precisely the same way, and the American structure of society will be fundamentally altered according to a wholly different design.

If this analysis be true, as I believe it to be, can we then ignore the sandstorm that bids fair to sweep away the characteristics of a civilized world?

Our vital national interests are deeply involved in the outcome of this great struggle. The American way of living will be changed beyond recognition if a glorified personal

state, faithful only to savage force as the arbiter of mankind is to dominate the world. Whether we like it or whether we don't, our destiny, fashioned in our traditional form, is inevitably linked to the future of those nations that cherish the fundamental values that have characterized this Republic since the day of its birth.

This is not merely another European war. This is a World War. This is a struggle between two wholly contradictory, two clashing, ways of life. We can not escape the consequences of its outcome. Should the Allies—the lands of Rousseau and Burke—succeed, it will be difficult enough to reconstruct a peaceful world under freedom and individual responsibility. It will be impossible should they fail.

Manning, The Arizona Republic

But how about the Ground Floor?

The Fateful Hour

—An editorial in The New York Times, *printed as Germany invaded the Low Countries*

The first feeling of the people of this heartsick country must be sheer inability to believe that the thing long feared has actually happened, even though the evidence is spread before our eyes. Hitler has unleashed his total war. He has struck on the main front. He has staked everything on a gigantic gamble which, if he wins, will mean the end of freedom and democracy and culture throughout all Europe in our time.

If ever a war was made deliberately and brutally, without cause and without justification, it is this war which Germany has made on Belgium and the Netherlands. The claim of the Reich government that these small nations had failed to observe a strict neutrality is belied by the facts in the record. It is not for that reason that bombs are falling now on a gentle countryside, and spreading death and destruction through cities as fair as any in all Europe. It is because Hitler chose to strike where he thought the Western Front was weakest; because, in his mad desire to get his hands on the throats of France and Britain, he had not the slightest scruple about violating the pledges he had given to the Lowland countries; because these countries in themselves are integral parts of the western world—our world, the democratic world, the world in which men live under systems of government deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—and because Hitler means to destroy that world if he can do it.

The American people will know how to evaluate the broken German promises, the brazen disregard of treaty obligations, the obscene falsity of Nazi self-justification, the ruthlessness of Nazi war. They will find in the experience of Belgium and the Netherlands a moral for ourselves: a moral to put our house in order, to strengthen our defenses, to prepare ourselves against the consequences of German success which might spread war across the Atlantic or Pacific to our own hemisphere.

This is the fateful hour. We in America who live behind the defenses of the Western European nations which are the outposts of our own kind of civilization must watch with deep anxiety to see whether the line will hold. Hitler told his armies yesterday that this is victory or death for Germany. It is also victory or death for decent international conduct and the democratic way of life.

"We Must Prepare Now," Says A. E. F. Commander

—Condensed from a statement issued by General John J. Pershing on May 14

"Preparedness is as necessary today as it was for us when war was declared in 1917, and we find ourselves in practically the same condition. Congress has made certain appropriations for material, but that is far short of what I think America must do. Every energy in this country should be devoted to the idea of putting the United States in a condition of thorough preparedness against the possibility of war.

"None of us can tell when we may become involved in the struggle now raging with such tremendous fury in Europe. In my opinion, the very life of this republic depends on the energy and determination with which our people undertake the task of placing the United States in a state of thorough preparation.

Punch, London

"Now, to put this over properly, you'll have to learn German."

"In 1917 I sailed for Europe with nothing material available other than the will to do and a hasty plan as the basis for doing it. Our Allies protected us during more than a year of preparation. They provided us with the material. Today the situation is utterly different. This great country must, within itself, be prepared for whatever instant action is required for our security."

Winston Churchill Once Remarked:

—In October, 1938, there appeared in CURRENT HISTORY *an article by **Winston Churchill**, now British **Prime Minister**. It was entitled **"What Can England Do About Hitler?"** and it has prophetic qualities when read today. Extracts from the article follow:*

It has been said that if we do not stand up to the dictators now, we shall only prepare the day when we shall have to stand up to them under far more adverse conditions. Two years ago it was safe, three years ago it was easy, and four years ago a mere dispatch might have rectified the position. But where shall we be a year hence? Where shall we be in 1940? . . . .

After a boa constrictor has devoured its prey it often has a considerable digestive spell. It was so after the revelation of the secret German air force. There was a pause. It was so after German conscription was proclaimed in breach of the Versailles Treaty. It was so after the Rhineland was forcibly occupied. Now, after Austria has been struck down, we are all disturbed and alarmed, but in a little while there may be another pause.

There may not—we cannot tell. But if there is a pause, then people will be saying, "See how the alarmists have been confuted; Europe has calmed down, it has all blown over, and the war scare has passed away." Neville Chamberlain will perhaps repeat what he said a few weeks ago, that the tension in Europe is greatly relaxed. *The Times* will write a leading article to say how silly those people look who on the morrow of the Austrian incorporation raised a clamor for exceptional action in foreign policy and home defense, and how wise the Government was not to let itself be carried away by this passing incident.

All this time the vast degeneration of the forces of parliamentary democracy will be proceeding throughout Europe. Every six weeks another corps will be added to the German army. All this time important countries and great rail and river communications will pass under the control of the German General Staff. All this time populations will be continually reduced to the rigors of Nazi domination and assimilated to that system. All this time the forces of conquest and intimidation will be consolidated, towering up soon in real and not make-believe strength and superiority. Then presently will come another stroke? Upon whom? Our questions with Germany are unsettled and unanswered. We cannot tell. . . .

Now we know that a firm stand by France and Britain with the other Powers associated with them at that time (Germany's occupation of the Rhineland), and with the authority of the League of Nations, would have been followed by the immediate evacuation of the Rhineland without the shedding of a drop of blood, and the effects of that might have been blessed beyond all compare, because it would have enabled the more prudent elements in the German Army to regain their proper position, and would not have given to the political head of Germany that enormous ascendancy which has enabled him to move forward. . . .

For five years I have talked to the members of the House of Commons on these matters — not with very great success. I have watched this famous island descending incontinently, recklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. It is a fine broad stairway at the beginning, but after a bit the carpet ends. A little farther on there are only flagstones, and a little farther on still these break beneath your feet. . . .

But if mortal catastrophe should overtake the British Nation and the British Empire, historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled

by the mystery of our affairs. They will never understand how it was that a victorious nation, with everything in hand, suffered themselves to be brought low, and to cast away all that they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victory—gone with the wind!

The Sporting British

—An editorial in The Emporia Gazette, *edited by William Allen White*

Probably in no other country in Continental Europe could a scene take place like that which was enacted in England the other day when the Prime Minister and his associates told the plain, brutal truth to England in Parliament. Imagine the Russians or the Germans or the Italians being told frankly that they stood in grave danger of military defeat. You hear nothing in the totalitarian states and very little even in France except bragging about the might of the national army. England has as much "might" as any country. She is shy on airplanes. Whereupon she tells the square, cold, terrible truth to her people.

Which is a proof of British democracy. The British upper classes, entrenched for two or three hundred years, do not like the common man much. On the other hand, a growing distrust among the common people—the average middle class men and women of the type that makes America—has weakened the power of the British aristocracy. But through it all candor prevails. The truth gets around. The people know the truth, and the wisest man that ever trod this planet said: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The capacity for any people to know the truth measures the extent of their democracy. For upon truth will depend mass action in one way or another, through parliaments or public opinion. And after all, mass action—which is another name for self-government—is democracy implemented.

You have got to take your hats off to the British, whether you like their monarchial system or not, whether you respect their dumb and complacent aristocracy or not. For the British are the only people east of the American shoreline who know the truth and are really self-governing. The French come next. Then there is a long step into totalitarian ignorance, darkness and tyranny.

Hutton—The Philadelphia Inquirer

Holding up the Hired Hand

The Maginot Line: A Fort in Action

—Condensed from a broadcast to the U.S. by Dorothy Thompson, newspaper columnist, describing her visit to a French fort

The fortress is a great wooded hill that has been entirely excavated and there is nothing to indicate that the rolling hills are the covering of a hidden city where the guardians of France live, like the monks, at war, for months on end, the life of the strictest discipline, the truest comradeship and the most prime importance to the nation.

The black cement portals are invisible except from a few feet distance around the turn of a road that is itself a fort, with camouflaged gun emplacements. Today the very villages through which we passed are false. Picked houses that presented curtained windows and flowery window-boxes to the outside world are filled inside with cement and at the approach of the Nazis a gun will be fired between pots of primroses.

This fortress is like a huge battleship. The soldiers of the Maginot line forts do not speak of themselves as troops; they call themselves the crew. There is nothing of the stiffness and rigidity that one usually associates with military activity. The officers are men of intellect and one sees it in their faces. The commander of the fort has lived here for eight years and turns the old phrase around to read, "My fortress is my home." The commanding of such a fortress is the job of engineers and high technicians.

The soldiers reminded me far more of first-class, swift and capable automotive mechanics than troops. In well lighted rooms with technical books on shelves and even with a vase of lilacs and irises on the table, they were poring over maps or listening to telephones and writing esoteric numbers and figures on blackboards, from which with a quick nod another man with a clock on the wall was moving

a dial as the red light came on and went out again. When I asked what the officer was doing with the clock, the colonel explained: "We are being shelled by the German artillery from Weisemburg for the first time since the war began. The officer is dialing by figures information about the angle and caliber of the guns, the exact target on which they are trained with regard to wind and other weather conditions."

That was the first time I realized the fort was in action. It was absolutely quiet. There was not the remotest noise or a quiver of vibration. We were a hundred feet or so beneath the ground and somewhere above us far away great guns directed from this quiet room were throwing fire at the Nazis. In the terrible months-long war of the Germans to take the Verdun fortress in the last war, Frenchmen went mad from the terrible impact and vibration. It was the knowledge of this that resulted in the Maginot fortification.

Yesterday the inside of this fortress was probably the quietest spot in all France. There are only ten places in the whole fortress where the noise of battle, the unholy, inhuman, ear-shattering, nerve-destroying roar of great guns can be heard at all, and that is in the turrets of the guns. The commander of artillery asked me if I wanted to go up in one of the turrets. After a long ride of eleven floors in an elevator, I was ushered into a narrow chamber about ten feet square with painted steel walls and great ammunition cases.

They are conveyed along the ceilings like cashboxes in department stores. Here men in overalls over their uniforms were moving quickly and a sharp voice called, "Fire," and now I heard a muffled roar. The commander of the artillery stood at the foot of a narrow iron ladder that led upward to the trap-door.

"Would you like to go up to the gun chamber?" he asked.

Of course, I climbed up. I stood in a still narrower chamber. In the center was a platform. On each side of it, imbedded in shining steel, lay the enormous guns. A soldier in overalls stood across from me with his hands folded across his chest and with a nod gestured to me to do the same, so my arms would not get in the way of the men feeding torpedo-like shells from an automatic conveyor.

"Fire!" came the word from the bottom of the stairs from the officer taking his commands from the man at the clock 'way back from where we had come. From each side of each gun protruded a lever like the end of a bicycle handlebar. The soldier manning each gun gave it a tap with the palm of his hand, no harder than a light slap. There was a noise that seemed to raise the top of my skull. The soldier facing me opened his mouth and swallowed and indicated I should do the same, and I did. Another tap and again the terrific detonation. Ten times, in the roar, trying to keep my thoughts together, I began counting them; one for the Czechs and one for the Poles and one for the Norwegians and one for the Dutch, and then in the noise I lost track, and then a sharp order. The platform on which I stood suddenly began to sink.

We went back along miles of tunneled roads to the officers' mess, a dining room with a little bar and open fireplace, flowers on the table, and a wonderful French meal. The commander of the sector rose and made a little speech. He said, "We soldiers are not men of words; our life is a life of action. You come from a great country, dedicated to liberty" and so I raised my glass to all our lives and to all who have sympathy for our cause, to the Poles, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians, the English, and all free men everywhere.

When I got back to Nancy last night, I read in the official communique there had been fighting in the neighborhood of Weisemburg and the enemy had been repulsed. That is what I had seen.

The Bystander, London

"Why don't you boys paint this old-fashioned charm on your aeroplanes?"

French Women at Work

—Condensed from L'Ordre, *Paris*

With its high brick walls and blue windows this factory in a desolate landscape, hidden in a distant province, is not particularly remarkable. It is in fact similar to many others if one takes into consideration that here, as in one hundred other places in France, more and more powerful and greater quantities of arms are being turned out.

In this immense and austere building young women are manufacturing monsters of iron and fire—the modern airplane. They are very skillful. Their fingers glide over the duraluminum as skillfully as they handled silk only a short time ago. And they handle the tools as fast as the needle. Rapid and intelligent, these young working girls have adapted themselves to their new profession with surprising facility. There are 1,800 of them, all dressed in the same white overalls. They move around the machines and work-benches. In their uniforms they resemble opera bouffe mechanics. Their headbands in blue foulard are distinguished only by the way they are knotted. This gives free rein to the coquetry or the taste of each one of them. The foreladies wear collars, also blue. A three-colored colored flame is the insignia of the workshop.

From the circular saw to the assembly room, one must admire the fast and precise work. Here, on immense green tables, the ribbing is being assembled. There, behind a shop counter, with the attitude of a saleswoman another employee hands out yards and yards of tubes and dozens of rivets. Further on are the employees of the paint shops; some of them boil pieces of metal and others paint with meticulous care. Further along, women are assembling metal sheets and finishing wings. Girls are aligned in double ranks of eight on moving scaffolds. The first group has hardly begun assembling. The second has half finished. The third group has two-thirds finished. The fourth is below because the scaffolds, controlled from an electric switchboard, are lowered and shifted according to the progress of the construction. This arrangement prevents tiring the workers.

Everything has been calculated to reduce the physical efforts of the working woman; the portable drilling machine, the riveting guns have been specially constructed for them. Not one of the tools which they use weighs more than two pounds. This fortunate arrangement, in addition to making it possible that female labor can be utilized systematically, also makes for high efficiency. One should also think of the fact that the two wings of a single bombing airplane must receive 200,000 rivets.

In another corner of the immense building a few benches surround a blackboard. This is the school where all candidates for employment are sent. The courses last one week. With each lesson several apprentices give up. Thus, during these seven days a kind of self-selection and elimination takes place. Those who remain to the end are usually younger, and have had no time to lose the training of their schooldays. In general, seven remain out of twenty. The examination which follows this short course is mainly intended to determine skill. Thus, the length and the trouble of apprenticeship are reduced and the working girls utilized according to their disposition and ability.

During the first World War, more than 400,000 women worked on national defense. Today there are many times that number.

About twenty young women push the wagon which carries the wing as soon as it is finished. One order, one movement, and the difficult maneuver is accomplished. Not one face expresses fatigue or exhaustion. Nevertheless, orders are absolute and discipline is vigorous. The austere supervisor, also a woman, watches out for everything, but when the noon-time bell rings, laughs and shouts resound and youth retakes its rights.

World Happiness Called Nazi Aim

—Condensed from an article in Der Angriff, *of Berlin, by Dr. Robert Ley, head of the German Labor Front*

In Braunau on the Inn a man (Adolf Hitler) was born of humble, simple people who in his time shook Germany and the world to their foundations, who already today belongs to the greatest of all times and who one day—as we Germans, particularly we National Socialists, know—will be the greatest of the great.

He brought Germany to reason and thereby made us happy. We are convinced he will bring Europe and the world to reason and thereby make Europe and the world happy. That is his irrevocable mission.

We Germans of the present must march as banner carriers of a new and better world of reason and discernment! For us there is no going back. It is our holy, invincible idea. We believe we must destroy delusion and madness and substitute for a Europe always at war and therefore dedicated to deterioration a Europe orderly, reasonable and discerning.

Our revolution marches with us, and we know and believe that, as surely as in our internal struggles the final victory has resulted in the destruction of our enemies and the erection of a National Socialist order of reason, also in foreign politics Germany will come away with an unconditional definitive victory over the liberal Jewish world of London and Paris and that Europe will then have a new face and the people of our portion of the earth a better, happier future.

That is the mission of our Fuehrer, Adolf Hitler. That is the meaning of universal order. That we believe! For that we are marching!

Daily Mirror, London

"In Mein Kampf *I called you 'scum of the earth', but you can't complain any, because I've come to keep you company."*

Holland-Beyond-the-Seas

—Condensed from The Daily Herald, *London*

Rich though little Holland is in gold and securities—one of the richest countries in Europe—her greatest wealth is in the wealth of the Indies. Holland-Beyond-the-Seas includes Curacao, in the Caribbean, Surinam (formerly Dutch Guiana), in South America, and, most important of all, the archipelago officially known to the native inhabitants as Indonesia, known to many as the East Indies, and called by old mariners simply the Indies.

The islands, home of orang-utans, komodo dragons, hornbills and headhunters, producers of pearls, spices, rare woods, are inhabited by 60,000,000 brown-bodied souls, not counting some 1,500,000 Asiatics and Europeans.

Queen Wilhelmina of Holland has never visited her Empire (although one of New Guinea's highest peaks is named after her), but she can hardly fail to appreciate what a windfall came to her little country that day in 1602 when daring adventurers of the Dutch East India Company set out on a five-year voyage to claim the islands.

Like India, the Netherlands Indies are divided into territory governed by native rulers in treaty relations with the Dutch, and territory governed directly. The Dutch authorities strictly limit these rulers' allowances and make sure that a part of every little State's income finds its way into education, hygiene, public works.

In Batavia sits the *Volksraad,* a legislative assembly composed half of natives and subjects of foreign origin, and half of Hollanders. But the *Volksraad* has limited powers.

The real power rests in a tropical palace at Buitenzorg, outside Batavia, where lives His Excellency the Governor-General.

Apart from being able to tell high-sounding native potentates how to rule their States, he can also veto any measure that a rebellious *Volksraad* may pass. Moreover, he himself can make his own laws.

Unlike the British, early Dutch colonizers were not discouraged from marrying native women, and no social ostracism came to them or their half-caste children.

Moreover, the Dutch have scrupulously refused to allow the slightest tampering with the natives' moral code, even going so far as to bar missionaries in some islands.

The Dutch have experienced little trouble in the Indies, largely because the natives would rather enjoy a quiet life than bother with politics. Besides, they are split among more than 150 different races and languages, and this has the tendency to make widespread rebellion next to impossible.

Meanwhile, the 220,000 Dutchmen in the East Indies enjoy great comfort. No white man is so poor that he cannot afford at least two servants at salaries of about ten dollars a month, and the usual staff of a well-to-do household numbers six or seven. They enjoy the latest films from Hollywood in Java, Sumatra and Borneo, and almost all of them own cars.

But there is also work to be done—rubber to be tapped in Sumatra, oil to be drilled for in Borneo and Java, tin to be dug in Bangka. Coffee, tea, tobacco, sugar, rice are the more ordinary products; but copra as a basis for facial creams, lizard skins for shoes and handbags, Sumatra wrappers for cigars, cinchona bark for quinine; sandalwood and teakwood, ebony, and macassar oil are others.

To gather in these riches colonial Dutchmen are rewarded handsomely. In 1935 of the 85,000 Europeans who were earning a living in the East Indies some 64,000 were taxed on incomes of more than $5,000 a year; and 22,500 between $20,000 and $60,000 a year.

But more significant was what this trade did to the Netherlands. One-sixth of the Netherlands' entire population of eight and one half million people is dependent on the colonial trade.

U. S. to Be Invaded?

—Condensed from an editorial in The Daily Express, *of London, a newspaper owned by Lord Beaverbrook, new British Minister of Aircraft Production*

If, as a result of the German victory in the Low Countries, Britain ceases to control the Atlantic, the possibility of invasion of America is at hand.

Americans therefore have a period in which to make preparations. They should do so on a scale bigger than anything that ever has been known.

Canada Urges Planes

—Condensed from an editorial in The Globe and Mail, *Toronto*

During the past few months a section of the American press has discussed and criticized Canada's war effort. We have taken it as it came knowing we were struggling in a righteous cause, and that upon the outcome depended the future of the civilization which the United States and Canada would share alike. We are not over-proud of our contribution to date, but this is by no means due to lack of determination on the part of the people.

As we are friends and neighbors, sharing the same continent, speaking the same language, upholding the same traditions, thinking largely the same thoughts, we understand each other. We realize how the soul of America is wrenched by barbaric devastation and wholesale murder in the former homes of tens of millions of American citizens. We know that overwhelming numbers of the American people, like all Canadians, are aware that self-preservation demands the crushing of brute aggression.

In this sense the war, which the Canadian people took up of their own free will by an all but unanimous vote in Parliament, has come to all North America. We think it will not be resented if we express a Canadian point of view on how the American nation can make a major contribution immediately and uphold those principles on which its life is based.

Mr. Churchill's startling confession that the Allies are hampered by disparity in the air has shocked us all. On this fact may hang the fate of humanity. Manifestly, fighting planes must be provided in vast numbers quickly. There is but one source of large-scale supply. Our suggestion is that the United States back its strong moral support of the Allies with action that will overcome the disparity speedily, and let the world know that civilization will not be destroyed.

No other nation has the same genius for organization and capacity for mass production. If the United States government and industry would cooperate to place their unequalled facilities deliberately at the disposal of the Allies, it would lift the struggling defenders of civilization—of America's civilization—to new hope.

Even though it meant the granting of credits, would not assured success for the Allies and what they represent, their way of life, their methods of business, be of vital importance to the United States? What material value would remain if they lost, if the greater part of world trade were regimented to the barter and financial systems of Nazi-Communism?

No other nation can bring such powerful influence to bear on the outcome of this conflict, both materially and morally, simply by applying the facilities at its command in the direction of the cause it hopes with all its heart will triumph.

If the United States will produce the planes, the flower of Canadian youth—the best we have—will man them. They are waiting eagerly to do their part as they have done in the past. It may not be amiss to recall that out of 8,000,000 people, more than 50,000 laid down their lives in the last war, and 150,000 were wounded.

We speak thus to our American neighbors, realizing that our lot is a common one. Our future must be worked out together, whether clouds overhang for generations or sunshine comes again. We appeal for humanity's sake.

Our whole nation sympathizes with the wish of American mothers to spare their sons from getting into this struggle. The most effective way of keeping American youth out, and of preventing the war from invading America, is by backing up the Allied cause with strong material assistance.

Belgian-German Frontier Is 100 Miles Long

—*Condensed from a bulletin by* The National Geographic Society

The Belgian frontier against Germany is about a hundred miles, the Luxembourg boundary a little more than ninety. The boundary with France to the south, nearly 400 miles, is Belgium's longest. Netherlands territory extends along the north for about 280 miles.

The scenic Ardennes, rising not more than 2,000 feet in southern Belgium, and the Eifel hills in western Germany form a highland knob which has shunted invading armies to the north or to the south since the days of Caesar. The Ardennes district represents almost a fourth of Belgium's area.

Westward runs the central plateau of the Ardennes, cut by deep gorges, but ill-drained because of the character of the clay. The land is well-wooded but has little agricultural value. Because of its marshy character there are no clear-cut natural boundaries along the southeast.

It was from the north, from the city of Aachen, that the Germans invaded Belgium in the first World War. On the northern slopes of the Ardennes, Aachen had long been a popular German health resort. In the first World War the resort hotels were used for hospitals. And from Aachen trains carried supplies fanwise over railroads to the front, returning with loads of wounded soldiers.

Before the present German invasion of Belgium, all roads from Aachen to the Belgian border had been closed. Just over the border at this point lies Liége, principal railway center for lines southward. Important highways run through Liége and important bridges across the Meuse are defended by the city's guns.

It was the siege of Liége that retarded German advances in the first World War, permitting the massing of French and British troops.

Liége is an important industrial city, and the principal city of the French-speaking southern section of Belgium. After the first World War it became an important inland port with the construction of the Albert Canal connecting with Antwerp.

Lewis, The Milwaukee Journal

Playing for High Stakes

Ghent is also a canal-connected 'seaport.'

Antwerp is Belgium's principal port. Though it is on the Schelde (Scheldt) River more than fifty miles inland, it is the only natural port in Belgium. In addition to thousands of river craft, more than 10,000 seagoing vessels call yearly at Antwerp with 20,000,000 tons of merchandise. Before the first World War, Antwerp was one of the most heavily fortified cities in Europe and was, at that time, considered impregnable. It became one of the first cities on which Zeppelins rained their bombs.

The Meuse and the Schelde Rivers drain practically all of Belgium. Including its many canals, the country has over 1,300 miles of navigable waterways; the 6,000 miles of highway are exceeded somewhat by the railway mileage.

Among the important Belgian ports are Oostende, Zeebrugge and Brugge (Bruges), the last reaching the sea by a canal connecting with Zeebrugge. Belgium's coastline, between that of the Netherlands and France, measures but thirty-five or forty miles. It is a straight open coast, broken by no large rivers and backed by dunes rising as high as 100 feet to the south.

The largest city and capital is Bruxelles (Brussels), which also has canal connections with the River Schelde through its tributary, the tidal River Rupel. Its population, approaching a million, lives on seven hills in the valley of the little River Senne, the city's altitude varying from 60 to 330 feet above sea level. Here the Flanders plain is broken by rolling hills, but for the most part Belgium is a fairly level land, except for the Ardennes in the south. The slowly rising coastal plain does not break into rolling woodland for some sixty miles and even more from the coast.

Smaller than the State of Maryland, Belgium has a population of more than eight millions and is one of the more densely peopled countries of Europe. The longest straightaway stretch within the borders of Belgium would be east and west, not exceeding 170 miles; student flyers complain that they cannot get high-speed airplanes properly under way without fear of crossing international borders.

Belgium has wide agricultural interests: in addition to the growing of grains and vegetables, the country raises large numbers of cattle, hogs and horses. Prominent among its factories are sugar refineries and margarine factories. Its production of pig iron and steel reaches millions of tons annually. The coal demand is somewhat in excess of the domestic supply.

Mons, perennial battleground of the first World War, is the center of the most productive coal mining region in Belgium, known as the Borinage. The town has been called the Pittsburgh of Belgium. It lies about 40 miles west of Namur and was the scene of the first engagement of the British Expeditionary Force in August, 1914.

With the exception of the city state of the Vatican and tiny Monaco, Belgium is the most densely settled nation in Europe. It has a population of more than 700 persons to the square mile. The Netherlands has an estimated 680 people to the square mile. Despite an extensive and scientifically developed farming system, plus dairying and livestock raising this nation is by no means self-sufficient in foodstuffs. Belgium imports four-fifths of its wheat, much of its meat, poultry and dairy products.

Chronology of the European War

APRIL 20—Claiming that an Allied expeditionary force in Norway is marching inland from five landing places, British and French reports describe a race to seize strategic points from German troops marching north from Oslo.
—Germany agrees to send Rúmania large quantities of planes and munitions in return for trade concessions.

APRIL 21—German troops in Norway appear to have pushed their occupied zone north of Oslo as far as Hadeland, which brings the bulk of Norway's industries into their hands.
—Premier Mussolini tells the Italian people that they must prepare for any eventuality, that the watchword is "labor and arms."

APRIL 22—The Germans stage an aerial *blitzkrieg* and bomb many key towns in lower Norway. The Allies claim to be closing in on Trondheim from two sides and smash at the German forces north and east of Oslo. A "final assault" against 3,500 Nazis trapped at Narvik is reported by the British.
—Captain Robert Losey, Assistant American Military Attache for Air, is instantly killed in Dombas, Norway, when German bombers blast that important rail junction.
—The Balkans show grave anxiety over spying foreigners.

APRIL 23—The Nazis claim capture or destruction of 2,000 Allied troops in a second large battle around Lillehammer, Norway.
—Sir John Simon, Chancellor of the Exchequer, presents the United Kingdom with a war budget of $7,060,000,000 in addition to an estimated expenditure of $2,354,410,000 for the ordinary cost of government in the fiscal year.

APRIL 24—Battles north of Oslo and north of Trondheim continue, with the Germans pushing the Allies back.
—British bombers raid five Nazi air bases in Norway and Denmark. In retaliation, the Nazis raid Scapa Flow.

APRIL 25—President Roosevelt officially recognizes the existence of a state of war between Germany and Norway and declares this country's complete neutrality.
—The Germans advance deep into Norway. Britain admits retreats.
—Premier Reynaud repeats France's willingness to hold discussions with Italy, but Italy refuses to resume conversations.

APRIL 26—The British strike hard at the Germans in the air, bombing airports and troop transports after admitting that the enemy has "taken the first trick" in the Norwegian fighting.

APRIL 27—In a characteristic, lightning move in diplomacy, Chancellor Hitler seeks to justify his invasion of Norway by presenting "war guilt" documents attributed to Britain and Norway which it is claimed, show that Britain first planned to occupy the Scandinavian country on April 6—three days before the German invasion—for an attack on Germany. Details of the documents are described by Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop to the diplomatic corps and press representatives.
—Sir Samuel Hoare, British Air Minister, calls Ribbentrop's speech a "despicable lie."
—Berlin claims that three British cruisers have been put out of action by German aerial bombs.

APRIL 28—Scandinavia is skeptical of Berlin's charges that the Allies first planned an invasion of Norway. Foreign Minister Koht of Norway declares that the invasion had long been plotted by Germany.
—Yugoslavia warns Germany, Italy and Hungary that border guards will fire on planes violating her frontiers.

APRIL 29—The Russian Ambassador to London declares the Soviet Union is willing to make concessions to conclude a new trade agreement with Britain, but emphasizes the Soviet's right to sell its own products to Germany or to anybody else.
—Governor Stassen of Minnesota, temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention, predicts President Roosevelt will be defeated in the Middle West if he runs again, since that section is fearful that he might involve us in the European war.

APRIL 30—Following successes in central Norway, the Nazis smash at the Allied landing points.
—The Admiralty at London announces the loss of two submarines and two trawlers.
—Chancellor Hitler issues a proclamation hailing his soldiers in Norway and boasting that German victories have "conclusively nullified" the attempts of the Allies to beat Germany to her knees on the Scandinavian front.
—A group of Pittsburgh residents offer a reward of $1,000,000 in cash to the person or group who will deliver Adolf Hitler "alive, unwounded and unhurt" into the custody of the League of Nations for trial for his "crimes against the world."

MAY 1—War by land and air continues in Norway, and naval action is reported on the Kattegat.
—The government of Prime Minister Chamberlain faces a crisis as the feeling mounts in London that "somebody blundered" in the Norwegian campaign.

MAY 2—The Allied campaign in central and southern Norway collapses when Britain pulls her troops out of those areas just in time to save them from swiftly moving Nazi columns. Prime Minister Chamberlain tells Commons that the government is determined not to treat the Scandinavian campaign as a "sideshow," and will continue to fight the Nazi invaders from Norwegian soil. He declares, however, that the Allies will not be drawn into any adventure that would weaken them on other fronts.
—Allied warships are rushed to Alexandria, Egypt, and all British shipping is ordered out of the Mediterranean, indicating fear that Italy may enter the war on the side of Germany.
—King Haakon of Norway, his family, and his government flee to an unknown destination in the north.
—One of the immediate consequences of collapse of the Allied campaign in Norway is the submission to Nazi domination by Sweden, now cut off from the Atlantic sea lanes and at the mercy of Berlin.
—President Roosevelt confers with the Italian Ambassador in Washington, as the State Department receives a full report from Ambassador Phillips on his conversations with Mussolini. The American Ambassador is reported to have received assurances that Italy contemplates no war-like moves within the next ten days.

MAY 3—Allied forces withdraw from Namsos three weeks after landing in that Norwegian port in an effort to trap the Germans in Trondheim.
—While London denies that the Allies deserted the Norwegians, the government of King Haakon proclaims that it will fight on.

MAY 4—Having abandoned all Southern and Central Norway to the Germans, the British and French concentrate on driving the Nazis from Narvik, in the north.
—Berlin claims to have sunk a 30,000 ton battleship and a heavy cruiser, and to have damaged six other war vessels. London calls the German claims "fantastic."
—To counteract Fifth Column activities, Holland arrests a Nazi member of Parliament and twenty other persons.

MAY 5—London denies a Berlin claim that 2,300,000 tons of Allied shipping have been sunk since the start of the war, saying a more accurate figure would be half that much.
—Greece opens a strategic rail line between the Bulgarian border and the Port of Salonika, which is expected to be an important landing point for Allied

forces if they strike through the Balkans.

MAY 6—Yugoslavia calls 70,000 more men to the colors.
—Bulgaria's newly mechanized army is paraded through Sofia.
—German bombers sink a British, a Polish and a French destroyer.
—Soviet Russia speeds up fortifications on the southern shore of the Gulf of Finland.

MAY 7—Prime Minister Chamberlain defends his government's policy in Norway while the opposition attacks Britain's failures and Admiral Sir Roger Keyes, hero of the first World War, bitterly criticizes the Chamberlain policy. The British press registers indignation at the way Chamberlain has directed the operations in Norway.
—The Netherlands, indicating fear of invasion, cancels all military leaves.
—The official Hungarian news agency declares Berlin has asked for the right to send troops through Hungary, following talk that the Allies are striving to create a defensive alliance of all the Balkan countries.
—The Navy Department in Washington announces that the United States fleet will remain in Hawaiian waters indefinitely. This is generally linked with the insistence by the United States that Japan must not take over the Netherlands East Indies.

MAY 8—Prime Minister Chamberlain is upheld in Commons by a vote of 281 to 200 on the issue of the conduct of the war. But political observers are convinced Chamberlain will have to reconstruct his Cabinet or resign. David Lloyd George, British Prime Minister in the last war, demands Chamberlain resign.
—The battle for Narvik continues.
—Pope Pius expresses the fear that the war will spread to other nations.

MAY 9—Prime Minister Chamberlain is beset with accusations in the House of Commons of "bungling" the war.
—Celebrating the fourth anniversary of the founding of the new Italian Empire, Premier Mussolini makes a brief speech which further obscures Italy's plans.

MAY 10—Germany invades the Netherlands at 3.00 A. M. in a campaign of electrifying speed and power. German troops land by parachute. Other Germans cross Maas River in rubber boats.
—German parachute troops make surprise landings in Belgium and German bombs blast the airport at Brussels. Luxembourg also is invaded.
—Berlin insists that, as in the case of Norway, German action had to be taken in Holland and Belgium to forestall an attack planned by the Allies.
—Neville Chamberlain resigns as Prime Minister, to be succeeded by Winston Churchill. Allied armies race across Belgium for a death struggle with the German army.
—British troops occupy Iceland to prevent possible German seizure of that former Danish possession.
—News of the German invasion of the Netherlands is flashed to the East Indies where the Governor-General immediately announces that all Germans of military age will be interned.
—Addressing the American Scientific Congress meeting in Washington, President Roosevelt condemns Germany's invasion of Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg and pictures Nazi aggression as a definite threat to the security of the Americas.

MAY 11—The Germans claim the capture of the key fort in the defenses of Liege, Belgium.
—The Dutch army withdraws from the frontier.
—Winston Churchill names a war Cabinet, with Neville Chamberlain as Lord President of the Council.
—London announces that Allied forces have landed at two Netherlands West Indies to prevent possible sabotage by German residents.
—The Japanense government declares that the war must not spread to the Netherlands East Indies.
—President Roosevelt sends a message to King Leopold of the Belgians expressing sympathy for his country.
—The Pope sends his blessing to Queen Wilhelmina, King Leopold and the Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg.
—Anti-British feeling mounts in Rome.

MAY 12—The Netherlands High Command admits the Germans have crossed the Maas and Yssel Rivers and that the Dutch defenders have withdrawn at many points.
—The German High Command says its air force subdued Fort Eben Emael, one of the strongest links in the Liege-Albert Canal defense zone of Belgium, through the use of an amazing secret weapon.
—Premier Reynaud announces in Paris that German parachutists, wearing Allied uniforms or civilian clothes, will be killed immediately.
—Foreign Minister Cantilo of the Argentine declares in Buenos Aires that neutrality is a "dead conception."

MAY 13—The Germans drive well into the heart of Belgium and claim the capture of Liege while a lightning advance across the flooded areas carries the Nazis to Rotterdam to the relief of "suicide battalions" of parachutists.
—Queen Wilhelmina of Holland, the Crown Princess Julianna, her consort and two children take refuge in England.
—New demonstrations in Rome fan hostility toward the British.
—The German High Command announces that ten French prisoners of war will be executed for every German parachutist shot by the French.

MAY 14—Holland surrenders "to prevent annihilation."

—British light tanks and armored cars engage in a battle with the Germans in Belgium.
—Premier Mussolini, smiling, makes balcony appearances before demonstrators after Fascists burn British flags.

MAY 15—The main bodies of the German and Allied armies meet for the first time in a battle along the Meuse. The Germans capture Sedan.
—A German thrust towards Brussels is preceded by heavy bombardment of Louvain, 15 miles to the east.
—The Germans occupy The Hague and in Berlin the capitulation of The Netherlands is hailed.
—The Netherland Foreign Minister, in Paris, declares that the entire Empire of his country has been placed at the disposal of the Allies including the East Indies.
—Switzerland completes mobilization as German troops concentrate along the Rhine. The French mass troops at their Swiss frontier, fearing lest the Germans open up that front.
—The Greek Government rushes troops to its frontier along Albania.

MAY 16—The war on the Western front is confined mostly to the air as planes battle above the Belgian plain and over the French border.
—Premier Reynaud tells the nation that the situation is serious.
—President Roosevelt warns Congress that the United States must be prepared to defend itself and asks $1,182,000,000 more for defense to give the United States a bigger navy, army and an air force of 50,000 battle planes.
—The Swiss close their northern frontier with Germany from Basle to Lake Constance.
—A message from President Roosevelt is delivered to Premier Mussolini. It is believed to contain a plea for Italian neutrality.

MAY 17—Berlin reports that the Allies are retreating on a wide front.
—Mechanized German forces are pouring through a gap in the Allied front.
—The British Expeditionary Force in central Belgium begins a "strategic" withdrawal, abandoning Brussels and Louvain to the Nazis.

MAY 18—French claim to check Nazi drive as Germans swing to the West toward the channel ports.
—British bomb Hamburg-Bremen oil stores.
—Premier Paul Reynaud takes over the direction of the war with a reorganization of his cabinet in which he exchanges places with Daladier, who becomes Foreign Minister.

MAY 19—Fierce battle of tanks rages at St. Quentin. Observers believe that the battle is nearing a decisive stage.
—General Maxime Weygand is appointed Chief of the General Staff and Commander in Chief of all theaters of operation. He replaces Marshal Maurice Gustave Gamelin.
—Prime Minister Winston Churchill summons his people to a "total war" against Germany.

Relief for Poland

(Continued from page 41)

of 755,000 from Warsaw, Cracow, Lubin and smaller cities, need feeding, as well as 1,800,000 refugees from burnt villages devoid of sustenance. There must also be partial feeding of 600,000 employed persons receiving a daily meal in lieu of other pay. This does not include children.

The total number of persons, therefore, within the Gouvernment General in need of emergency food supplies when this report was made, was 6,150,000 and has undoubtedly increased to more than 7,000,000 by this time.

DONATIONS for Polish relief should be sent to your state committee of the Paderewski Fund for Polish Relief, or to the central office at 37 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y. The Paderewski Fund is a money raising organization which turns its donations over to the Commission for Polish Relief to buy food and clothing to send to Poland.

Keynoter Stassen

(Continued from page 37)

wide politics by helping to organize young Republicans. He won changes in the state-wide party that he thought would make for greater control from below.

When he ran for Governor, his liberal tendencies were much in evidence. Stassen insisted that labor and business both get a square deal. He advocated a labor relations law that would reduce industrial strife without infringing fundamental rights of labor. He also championed a sweeping civil service law and demanded major economies in government.

First item of business when the legislature met in 1939 was Governor Stassen's reorganization program. Its main provisions were adopted, with substantial savings to the state. The highway department saved $111,000 in traveling expenses of its employees during nine months. Its equipment rental charges ran $1,000,000 less for a year than under the previous administration. There were dozens of other economies.

Stassen and the Legislature co-

operated on a civil service law that has been highly praised. Veteran workers retained their places. Others were required to take qualifying tests. New employees must compete in open examinations for places. For the first time, the state has civil service in all departments.

Labor relations were Stassen's other great interest. Minnesota has had its share of strikes, lockouts and hard feeling. Labor interests asked for a "little Wagner Act," protecting rights of workers against employers. Rural interests desired a bill drastically limiting the rights of unions. Stassen called representatives of all factions into conference, and a bill emerged steering a course down the middle. It is the present Minnesota Labor Relations Act.

The act is administered by a State Labor Conciliator, a former union president, whose job is to confer with both sides in a threatened strike or lockout and bring about a solution before production actually stops. No strike or lockout can be called until after attempts have been made to settle disputes, and not until ten days after the Conciliator has been notified that strike or lockout action is contemplated. In industries "affected with a public interest"—utilities, food stores and the like—another thirty days may elapse before a strike or lockout begins, at the discretion of the Governor and the Conciliator. During the breathing spell a commission may be named by the Governor to investigate and report.

The labor relations act is perhaps the most strikingly successful part of the whole Stassen program. Strikes and lockouts have been far below the national average since the law took effect. The state's largest city, industrialized Minneapolis, has had no new strikes whatever during the first quarter of 1940, a record unique in recent years.

Some criticism of it has come from labor leaders. But Stassen and the labor Conciliator insist that the rank and file of labor support it.

The Governor will probably be reelected this fall. It is also no secret that Stassen has his eye on the Senate seat that Ernest Lundeen now holds. He will have his opportunity to win it in 1942.

Many Stassen enthusiasts are convinced that he cannot be stopped in his march toward the presidency. He could not run for President until 1944, because of his age. But even if he passed up 1944 and was nominated in 1948, he would still be, if elected, the youngest President in the nation's history. He could wait until 1956—sixteen years—and still be a younger man, on taking office, than was Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933.

What Will America Do About Canada?

(Continued from page 36)

possible exception of Oceania, to which Japan might insist on helping herself with the Netherland Indies for good measure.

If the United States allowed the Allied cause to fail, Canada would immediately present a vital issue. It is impossible to escape the conclusion that Britain, seeing herself on the road to complete defeat, would transfer as much of her resources and population as she could to her senior Dominion, where they could enjoy the protection of the Atlantic Ocean and the Monroe Doctrine. She would probably seek to transfer a substantial portion of her merchant marine to Canadian registry and perhaps even part of her navy. And it is not likely that Australians and New Zealanders would stay long in Oceania if Japan took it over.

What would the United States do in such a situation? Would she close the frontiers of this continent to a new flood of refugees, this time of her own blood and language? One can hardly imagine Americans refusing a New World sanctuary to fugitives from the cradle of their own race. It would also be to the interest of the United States, faced with the necessity of defending Canada, to see it as populous and productive as possible. It would equally be in the interest of Germany to see that its victims and its booty did not escape to found overseas a new nucleus from which the persistent British race might again sally forth in years to come.

Almost inevitably, Canada would furnish a cause of war in such conditions unless Germany found herself too weakened in the hour of her triumph to take on a new and powerful antagonist. She would undoubtedly regard such a development with the virtuous indignation that a gangster feels when he learns that his spoils have been hi-jacked and his kidnaped prisoner has escaped.

The Third Term

(Continued from page 39)

admit error. The third-term boosters are saying that if the schemes have not succeeded according to their blueprints, it is not their fault, but the fault of the people for not reacting as they expected.

The fact is that the third-termers are seeking desperately to draw attention away from the failure of their domestic policies. Therefore much of the third-term drive centers upon the wars abroad. New Deal spokesmen repeat with monotonous regularity:

"FDR will await developments in Europe before refusing a third term. If the war becomes sufficiently acute, he may respond to the call of the country and remain in office."

We may expect much propaganda to the effect that Roosevelt is the only man who can not only save America but work for world peace. This is mere wishful thinking, of course. The idea that Mr. Roosevelt is so well informed on foreign affairs that no one else can guide the ship of state while a war wages in Europe is ridiculous. He has no better nor closer access to information on the war situation than would any other occupant of the White House.

The idea that his administration has in any measure been a guarantee of world peace, or would be in the future, is equally ridiculous. Has he averted any world crises since March, 1933? Since he became President, we have had Italy's invasion of Ethiopia; Hitler's remilitarization of the Rhineland, acquisition of Austria, dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, division of Poland; the Russian encroachment upon the Baltic states, assistance to Hitler in the looting of Poland and the war on Finland; the invasion of China by Japan, and the beginning of World War Number 2.

For these wars the President of the United States is not responsible. They were not in the orbit of his control. The real question, then, is whether FDR's record indicates that he desires this nation to remain strictly neutral, minding our own business and sawing our own wood, now and in the uncertain future ahead of us.

Read that record. Read his speech at Chicago in which he said we should "quarantine" the aggressor nations. Look at his insistence upon recognition of the Soviet government, which now has backfired with discovery of how deeply Russian influence has invaded our own national policies. Remember the submarines he saw—or said were seen by somebody—in the Atlantic.

We talk of keeping out of war. But we attempt to patrol a three-hundred-mile neutrality zone and dictate that the belligerents shall not engage in conflict within this limit—a stand that can be enforced only by arms. We have pushed our shores out some 297 miles, placing upon the American people the expense of patrolling this zone and inviting future complications which could lead to our involvement in war.

The President appointed James Cromwell, our diplomatic representative to Canada. When Mr. Cromwell made his famous speech aligning the United States on one side of the conflict, it called to mind the

President's statement during the neutrality debate last fall that we could not hope to be neutral in thought and feeling. It is significant that, despite the rebuke of the State Department, those backing a third term for President Roosevelt applauded Cromwell's speech enthusiastically.

The role of an unneutral non-participant in a war is a dangerous one. Is there any hope that such incidents would not intensify under four years more of Roosevelt? Would he keep us out of war?

Mr. Roosevelt must himself measure the amount of bitterness and suspicion, jealousy and strife his attempt to continue in control would engender among the American people. The American people, meanwhile, must meet this challenge in the only way they can meet it and retain their cherished traditions. They must preserve the precious heritage that is theirs, a government of laws rather than of personal leadership, a democracy with truly representative government in which no man, however much he may covet power, is indispensable.

France at War

(Continued from page 14)

faction advocating a policy not much different from that of the Communists. The difference is that the French Socialists, however muddleheaded they may be, are at any rate muddling their own heads and not obeying orders from Moscow. It is also perfectly obvious that the Moscow line may very well take a strongly anti-German turn with the development of the war. In that case the poor bewildered French Communists will have to do another right-about-face and may find themselves in the closest agreement with the Right parties here, the General Staff and the rest. For they are not—this is incontrovertible—pacifists at all. The only pacifists surviving now in Europe are the pre-1914 Socialists, who survive, only in France.

I think it is an indication of the essentially democratic nature of the social and political structure here that they do survive and command an audience. They think that "the German people will take care of Hitler," which is a typically old-time Socialist way of begging the question.

Poison Gas: Terror Over Europe

(Continued from page 24)

suffered by Britain, Germany, France and the United States, and for only 2 per cent of the deaths. A man gassed in the war had twelve times as good a chance of complete recovery as a man wounded by shell or shrapnel.

Gas became important in the World War because of its effectiveness in producing casualties. Military authorities prefer to incapacitate rather than kill since it takes four sound men to evacuate and care for one man wounded in action.

The most important task Europe faces in the present war is the prevention of panic and confusion in case of sudden gas attack. Then, too, the public must be educated concerning the various types of gases and taught to use as efficiently as possible whatever means of protection do exist. Civilians must be warned when an attack begins. When it is over, the casualties must be cared for and the gassed areas disinfected—with chloride of lime, if mustard gas is used.

Phosgene is the agent typically used to produce lung injuries. Medical treatment is based on the principle of the conservation and additional supply of oxygen. Absolute rest is essential. The gassed person's clothing is loosened to aid respira-

(Continued on page 64)

"War is futile."

All the miles of oceans that separate us from Europe where war is being fought and from China where war is being fought, cannot drown out or submerge those words.

"War is futile."

It is a grim hoax on the people made to sacrifice for it, a killer of ideals as well as of men, a robber of the very freedom it pretends to uphold, a destroyer of the civilizations it purports to protect.

No one knows what new miseries the present wars will inflict upon humanity.

No one knows what new revolutions they will breed. No one even seems to have a clear idea of just what peace will bring, for when the confused peoples in warring countries ask for an explanation of war aims their confused leaders give them the fuzziest kind of answers.

If peace comes quickly enough, maybe that peace will be one that will really tend to prevent future wars. That's why we here in America should hope for the war to end soon—to end before we, too, succumb to the insanity. That's why we should do more than hope—why we should *work* for peace.

World Peaceways consists of a group of people whose entire time is spent in *working for peace*. It is a non-profit, non-crackpot organization, that's striving with a purpose and a plan for keeping America out of this current version of Europe's centuries-old war. We need the help of every decent American who feels that in peace lies not only America's greatest hope, but the world's.

Write to World Peaceways, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, New York City.

tion, and oxygen is administered when necessary.

The British government has issued an official booklet, "The Protection of Your Home Against Air Raids," describing the proper preparations for gas defense. The booklet advised the construction of underground concrete shelters which are ventilated, bombproof and gas-proof. If the entire population were to be protected by underground shelters, the cost, it is estimated, would be from five to seven billion dollars, an impossible sum. So the lay person is advised to gas-proof a room by closing the fireplace, sealing all crevices with a mush made of newspapers and water and boarding up the windows or preventing panes from breaking by pasting sheets of heavy paper over them. Articles to be placed in the gas-proofed room are carefully listed—water for drinking and fire fighting, canned food and a can opener, books, playing cards, even children's toys.

Some months ago, an office building containing gas-proof and bombproof rooms was constructed in London. All new government buildings must be so equipped. Both England and France have partially evacuated the larger cities and are ready to complete evacuation at short notice. The French authorities have forced the removal of airplane factories from Paris to scattered localities in rural France. Electric power plants, water works and other vital public utilities are being safeguarded. In Leningrad special gas-proof cellars are being constructed large enough to accommodate all the people living in an apartment house.

However, such measures may be only partially effective. Underground shelters must have air chimneys to supply the indispensable oxygen, or large filters similar to those used in gas masks, or chemical cartridges to remove carbon dioxide in addition to tanks to supply oxygen. Air chimneys may be destroyed by high explosives. The filters, which remove the poison gases that enter the chimney, are soon exhausted and of no further value. Chemical means of supplying oxygen and removing carbon dioxide are very expensive. If the city power house, one of the first objectives of an air attack, is destroyed, light, heat and means of cooking are destroyed simultaneously. In any case, the prohibitive cost makes it impossible to provide underground shelters for more than a few hundred thousand persons.

The improvised family gas-proof shelters advocated by the British government two years ago are said to be effective for a maximum of twelve hours. But what are the people to do at the end of twelve hours if the other windows in the house have been broken and the area has been contaminated by gas?

The Cambridge University Scientists' Group tested such a home-made, gas-proofed room. They found that, if there is enough mustard gas outside the room to kill a man in an hour, seepage of gas into the room would make it impossible for anyone in the room to remain alive for more than three hours. They also discovered that a million people in Great Britain do not have a room to set aside for gas protection, and that seven million more must live in overcrowded conditions if they are to have one.

As for the free British gas mask, no one knows how effective it really is since the Home Office has refused to permit any independent body to test it. The government has tacitly admitted the limited protection afforded by the civilian gas mask by distributing more elaborate and expensive ones to civilians on active duty during air raids.

The protection offered by gas masks is not always automatic and complete. If leakage is to be avoided, the mask must be without the least rip or tear; it must be sterilized for each wearer and renewed after each gas attack. With well-trained troops and masks in perfect condition, there is protection. But if the mask wearers become confused and fearful, or if the chemicals and charcoal in the mask are not renewed, or rips develop in the mask through continuous use, then protection becomes doubtful. No expert knows how long a gas mask is efficient without a renewal of the chemicals which neutralize some kinds of gases and charcoal to which others cling.

Poison gases will play a definite role in the Second World War as soon as one of the belligerents finds it advantageous and the struggle becomes desperate. Gas demonstrated its efficiency and economy in the last World War. International agreements can no more prevent the use of poison gases than they can prevent earthquakes. To prevent gas warfare, we must prevent war.

Printed in the U.S.A.

FREE..BOTH these books

(Continued from other side)

fraction of the usual cost, you BALANCE your reading as you have always wished — between the newest books and the world's finest masterpieces! You keep up with modern books, by best-selling authors like Sinclair Lewis, Philip Gibbs, Wm. McFee, Vicki Baum, Somerset Maugham, Edna Ferber, Daphne du Maurier. And *at the same time* you build a fine, uniformly-bound library of literature's greatest works — like *The Way of All Flesh*, *Madame Bovary*, *Thais*, *Treasure Island*, *Nana*, and countless others.

What You Get Is DOUBLED . . . but What You Pay Is HALVED!

You *keep* these TWO books as a GIFT — if, after 5 days' free examination of them, you THEN decide to join the Book League. Then, as a member, you receive each month, not *one* book, but a *double-selection* of great books! Yet you pay actually *less than half* of what you would ordinarily pay. Only $1.39 — not for each, but for BOTH books!

Nothing is sacrificed in quality to make possible this amazing "double-value" $1.39 price! The modern best-seller you receive is exactly the same edition selling for $2.50 to $4.00 everywhere. And the world's great masterpieces you receive month by month are uniformly-bound — so that you steadily build up a valuable lifetime library of the world's finest literature that you and your children will always cherish.

We can only offer such values because our 20,000 members provide an ASSURED sale. So we do not have to allow for the usual waste of over-printing and left-over copies. Likewise, modern authors, assured of a quantity sale, accept lower royalties. And publishers lend us their plates for League editions, thus saving us the heavy expense of type-setting and plating

How You Can Save $2.50 Every Month:

1 As a *Membership-Gift* you will receive — entirely *FREE* — these TWO books *Shanghai '37* by Vicki Baum and *Wuthering Heights*, by Emily Bronte

Then, as a member, you will receive two fine books each month — for ONLY $1.39 for both! Here are the kind you get:

2 *One* will be a newly-published modern book of either fiction or non-fiction, by today's best known, biggest-selling authors — such as Sinclair Lewis, Edna Ferber, Somerset Maugham, and Daphne du Maurier. These are books which are priced (wherever books are sold) at from $2.50 to $4.00 each.

3 The OTHER BOOK will be a famous, uniformly-bound masterpiece of great literature for your lifetime library by such authors as Dumas, Voltaire, Oscar Wilde, Victor Hugo, and Thackeray

Thus you get — for only $1.39 — TWO books conservatively valued at $4.00. Your savings average about $2.50 each month. And you get two books FREE, at the start, as a Membership Gift!

You saw the sensational moving picture . . . Now read the thrilling book itself!

WUTHERING HEIGHTS

By Emily Bronte

FREE — the book from which surged one of the most powerfully emotional moving pictures of our time — a smash hit — from coast to coast! Now you can wander again across the wild moors. Revel in the love scenes between fierce Heathcliff and spirited Cathy. Bury yourself for hours in the rugged, savage English northlands. Feel the rush of the unbridled passions that swept through Wuthering Heights like a furious gale. This is a splendid book for your lifetime library, one of the great books of all time. For the moving picture may one day be forgotten — but Wuthering Heights, the book, is a masterpiece that can never die.

Just Published!

SHANGHAI '37

By Vicki Baum

FREE — this exciting new novel NOW selling everywhere at $2.75! A thrilling story of Shanghai with bombs raining death and destruction. At the Hotel Shanghai are nine people whose lives have become tangled together, two young people in love; a wealthy Chinese merchant and his radical son; a German-Jewish refugee doctor, a glamorous Russian adventuress, and her dissipated English husband; a sinister Japanese journalist-spy, a poor coolie opium addict.

Why should these strange lives remain entangled even in death — when a Japanese bomb strikes? The answer brings you one of Vicki Baum's most compelling, colorful novels.

The New York Times calls it: "The best of Vicki Baum's books — better even than 'Grand Hotel'."

"Full of action . . . an interesting, exciting, melodramatic book." — *Book-of-the-Month Club News.*

SEND NO MONEY! 5 DAYS' FREE EXAMINATION

Accept *Shanghai '37* and *Wuthering Heights* as a FREE membership gift now. We know you will like them — but still we want you to judge for yourself. So read them for 5 days. If they DO show you that you will enjoy Book League membership — keep them without cost; and your membership will start with next month's selection. If *not* — then merely return them to us without any obligation.

But we have only a limited supply to fill requests from this announcement. The card here will bring your copies by return mail — *if* you mail it promptly. To see for yourself how "America's Biggest Bargain Book Club" brings you big savings on the *modern* books you want to read — and how, *at the same time*, it also builds for you a beautiful library of the world's finest masterpieces — mail this special card (without money) AT ONCE. (No stamp needed.)

BOOK LEAGUE OF AMERICA
Dept. C.H. 6, 15 West 48th Street, New York City

This Card Entitles You to

SHANGHAI '37, by Vicki Baum
WUTHERING HEIGHTS, by Emily Bronte — BOTH FREE

BOOK LEAGUE OF AMERICA
Dept. C.H. 6, 15 West 48th Street, New York City

Please send me — FREE — WUTHERING HEIGHTS and SHANGHAI '37 (a new book selling everywhere at $2.75). Within 5 days I may return them if I care to — and thus cancel this membership application.

Otherwise, I will receive next month's double-selection and each of the forthcoming monthly double-selections for a year. I will pay only $1.39 (plus few cents postage) each month for BOTH books.

Name______________________________

Address______________________________

FREE..BOTH these books

NOT ONLY THIS BOOK

WUTHERING HEIGHTS — BRONTE

BUT THIS BOOK TOO

VICKI BAUM — SHANGHAI '37

Accept them as a
DOUBLE GIFT
from America's
Biggest Bargain Book Club!

And THEN every month you receive not one, but two great books like these—both for only $1.39

FREE—to YOU! Vicki Baum's thrilling new novel, *Shanghai* '37, a book now selling everywhere for $2.75 which has been hailed by critics as even finer than her "Grand Hotel" and "Tale of Bali." AND, also FREE — one of the greatest masterpieces of all time — Emily Bronte's WUTHERING HEIGHTS!

Here is why we offer you not one, but BOTH of these books FREE:

These two books will be sent to you as a FREE Membership-Gift — to show you why its members (and there are 20,000 of them!) enthusiastically call the Book League: "*America's Biggest Bargain Book Club!*"

Each month members receive, at an amazing *double*-saving, not one, but TWO books. One is an up-to-the-minute modern best-seller that every one is reading and talking about — like *Shanghai* '37. The *other* is a well-bound work to add to your library of the world's book treasures, to be read at your leisure — like *Wuthering Heights*.

Imagine a "double-value" like this! For only a

(Continued on Inside Cover)

merica Needs F.D.R. Says Sen. Guffey 25¢

CURRENT HISTORY

The World Today in Books

NORMAN COUSINS

Announcement to Subscribers

CURRENT HISTORY has become CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM. This merger between two of America's oldest monthly magazines is not only an important event in publishing history, but it is also a logical step toward the creation of a finer and more significant periodical.

For years much overlapping has been noticeable in the two publications. In issue after issue many authors and articles could have been exchanged without affecting either magazine. The two have been bound together by a common purpose to discuss contemporary affairs from an objective standpoint. Both have laid emphasis on books and reading; both have used the technique of debate in presenting controversial questions; both have been edited for intelligent, alert people who are accepted as leaders in their own communities.

Each magazine, however, makes a definite contribution to the merger. For instance, CURRENT HISTORY's authentic analysis of today's men and events in the departments *"History in the Making"* and *"They Say"* reflects a nationwide interest kept alive by the staggering developments that beset the world today. As for the FORUM, by presenting social phenomena and the problems of daily life, together with entertainment, the arts and other vital factors in our national culture, it has rendered great service to the reading public. All these elements complement one another; all are current history.

We believe the merger of CURRENT HISTORY and the FORUM is literally a blending of the best of each into a forceful, well-balanced whole.

We invite you most cordially to send us suggestions, comments and criticism.

A special word to Forum subscribers: Because CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM will sell for $3 a year, $1 less than FORUM did, your subscription will be automatically extended to cover the difference in price.

The Editors

THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES was signed on June 28. On that day twenty-one years ago President Woodrow Wilson sent a message from France to the American people, explaining the significance of the treaty:

> It is much more than a treaty of peace with Germany. It liberates great peoples who have never before been able to find the way to liberty. It ends once and for all the old and intolerable order under which small groups of selfish men could use the peoples of great empires to serve their ambition for power and dominion . . . There is ground here for deep satisfaction, universal reassurance, and confident hope.

One day later, June 29, 1919, a newspaper in Berlin spoke about the same treaty:

> The German people will again strive to attain that place among the nations of the world to which it is entitled.
>
> Then, vengeance for 1919!

Here, in a capsule, is a large part of the story told by Walter Millis in *Why Europe Fights* (Morrow, $2.50). Bound up in these two quotations are fundamentally contradictory approaches to the problems of a post-war world which pointed even then to the inevitability of another clash.

On one side was a noble but nearsighted idealism based more on hope than on actions, and a reluctance to face realistically the fact that there are but two ways to deal with a defeated enemy: either destroy him altogether so that he can never fight again—in which case the victor is accused of barbarous, unnecessary severity—or deal with him generously so that he may be too kindly disposed to fight again—in which case the victor is accused of stupid, suicidal gallantry. Neither of these two extremes appealed to the treaty-makers, and thus there emerged the Bitter Sweet of Versailles—sufficiently sweet to permit Germany barely to retain her life, but sufficiently bitter to render that life so tortuous that Germany would never forget it had been humbled in war.

And on Germany's side was a tenacity and a vindictiveness which threatened revenge even while the defeated soldiers were turning over their guns. The war for them had not ended; it was a lull or an interval in which they might lick their wounds and organize their forces and resources for a later and more effective attempt.

This picture of a continuing World War has been drawn before, but never more sharply or clearly than in *Why Europe Fights*. Mr. Millis makes few conclusions and offers no prognosis, but the long rows of evidence assembled in this book all point to the suspend-and-resume theory. "Our day," Hitler has told his people, "has come after twenty years." One by one, the German ruler has whittled down and broken every peace pledge made by Germany in 1919. The nation became gorged with guns and cannon and tanks and planes—the most efficient array of apparatus for mass blood-letting yet devised by the destructive genius of man.

"My beer is the DRY beer!"

says

ARTHUR DONOVAN

Foremost boxing referee, who chooses Rheingold Extra Dry Lager Beer

A Quicker Quencher
. . . because it's NOT SWEET

The beer for beer-lovers
. . . because it's LIGHT

Perfect companion for savory foods
. . . because it's DRY

Thank you, Arthur Donovan. More than a hundred years ago, in the bare-knuckle era of fighting, we were already brewing fine beer. Today Rheingold Extra Dry Lager Beer is so popular that it can be enjoyed at an increasing number of places. There must be one near you, so call for Rheingold Extra Dry Lager Beer!

Photograph by Paul Hesse

Rheingold

EXTRA DRY

Lager Beer — Not Sweet

BREWED BY *Liebmann Breweries,* BREWERS FOR OVER 100 YEARS

Rheingold Extra Dry Lager Beer is on sale in bottles and on tap at all good taverns and package stores throughout the East. © 1940. Liebmann Breweries, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.

And today Germany, which dedicated herself to war, has resumed the fighting of twenty years ago, capitalizing upon the military flabbiness of nations which were dedicated to peace.

It would be a gross over-simplification of history, however, to say that Europe is in a fight today only because it did not finish the last fight. That is but one, although an important one, of the causes. Mr. Millis believes that the dynamic totalitarian state, particularly in its German form, is a principal factor. But in a larger and perhaps more abstract sense, Europe is fighting again for much the same reason she has always fought—the presence on one small continent of several dozen nations of varying and conflicting ambitions and personalities, their common ties weakened and their differences emphasized by trade barriers, customs unions, and minor and major animosities and rivalries. In a direct and specific sense, of course, Europe is fighting because one nation embarked upon an active policy of conquest which she would not or could not halt. And thus there emerges a moral factor of tremendous significance for Americans. Despite all the errors of omission and commission by Britain and France, it becomes clear that their sins shrink into insignificance compared with the crimes, past, present and prospective, of the Nazi juggernaut.

The factors which have gone into the making of the World War, Part II, may never be completely described. The entire picture represents a complicated mosaic so huge that its pattern, if there is a pattern, is not visible as an entity; indeed, even some of the individual units seem amorphous and unrelated. But many of the important sections, thanks to Mr. Millis, are now discernible not only in relation to each other but in relation to the whole.

It may be seen, for example, that the Bitter Sweet of Versailles was not so much responsible for the recurrence of the war today as the inept handling of the treaty by Britain and France. It may be seen that the weaknesses of the democracies were not so much in their lack of preparedness as in their lack of vision, and in their inability to work with each other.

CURRENT HISTORY and FORUM

July, 1940

Contents

WAR AND DEFENSE

- Arms for America . . . . *Basil C. Walker* 16
- Embattled Darkness . . . . *Vincent Sheean* 23
- Civilization Cannot Die . . . . *James Truslow Adams* 25
- War Imperils America! . . . . *Douglas Johnson* 45

GENERAL ARTICLES

- F.D.R. Must Run Again . . . . . *Senator Joseph F. Guffey* 20
- Youth Crusade . . . . *Frederick R. Bechdolt* 31
- "This Won't Hurt Much" . . . . *Marguerite Clark* 34
- Housing Does Its Part . . . . *Nathan Straus* 37
- Hawaii States Her Case . . . . *Lawrence M. Judd* 40
- The Banks Go Democratic . . . . *Howard Maier* 42

HISTORY IN THE MAKING 9

WHAT'S YOUR OPINION?——Should We Help the British Now?

A Debate. *Dr. Frederick L. Schuman vs. Norman Thomas* 27

FORUM QUIZ . . . . . Compiled by *Jo Hubbard Chamberlin* 49

THEY SAY 51

CHRONOLOGY 58

THE WORLD TODAY IN BOOKS . . . . *Norman Cousins* 1

THE BOOK FORUM . . . . *Eleanor Van Alen* 6

COVER PHOTO BY PICTURES, INC.

• • •

Current History and Forum. Volume LI, No. 11, July 1940. Whole No. 305. Current History combined with The Forum and The Century Magazine May 23, 1940. Current History and Forum published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation. Publication office, 20 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass.; New York office, 366 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. E. Trevor Hill, President, John T. Hackett, Vice-President; Roger W. Straus, Jr., Secretary; Edward F. Healey, Treasurer; Edward F. Healey, Advertising Manager. 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Central and South America and Spain; Canada 50c a year additional; elsewhere $1.25 a year additional. Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance. Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned. Entered as second-class matter April 18, 1939, at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879. Entered in Canada as second-class matter.

MEMORANDUM FOR LIBRARIANS:

CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM indexes are published in the last number of each volume.

Beginning with the present volume, 51, every volume will have twelve numbers and will run from September through August. The complete index for the volume will be in the August issue.

Important notice on page 64.

It may be seen that the first gun of the World War, Part II, was not fired in Poland or Czecho-Slovakia or Austria or Albania or Spain or Ethiopia, but on the Greek Island of Corfu on August 31, 1923, when Premier Mussolini's gunboats bombed and seized the territory in retaliation for the murder of an Italian official by supposed Greek assassins. The League of Nations was thus presented with its first clear case of international aggression, which it handled with more regard for the feelings of Mr. Mussolini than for its own statutes. The seizure of Corfu, in effect, was licensed by the League, paving the way for the long string of seizures which transpired in the years which were to follow.

That was in 1923—the year in which the wobbly structure of the post-War world first showed signs of a faulty foundation. That was the year of the financial collapse of Germany, when a trolley car ride cost 500 billion marks; when a former German corporal rushed out on the platform of a crowded hall in Munich, fired two shots into the ceiling, and shouted he had come to take over the government. That was the year which saw the first of many splits between Britain and France, this time over the occupation of the Ruhr.

The post-War world managed to hold together without serious difficulty until 1932, another fateful year, when disintegration set in from several directions. In the Far East, Japan began its conquest of China, with the United States ready to participate in direct efforts to push her out, but with Britain and the League unwilling to impose the full retaliatory penalties to which they were pledged. In Germany the former corporal came into power, not because he was chosen by the majority of the people—his popular support, in fact, was hardly a third of the total vote and his following had declined since the previous elections—but because he was able to push and bluster his way into office. He was the man of the hour.

It is possible, Mr. Millis believes, that Europe might have groped its way to peace despite all the mistakes of Britain and France, despite the ambitions and warlike actions of Italy and Japan—if it had not been for Hitlerism. "No one," Millis says, "can ever finally say just what 'caused' anything in history or who was the most responsible," but what seems to him the broadest reason was the "ultimate rise in Germany of an extreme, savage, and warlike government."

And yet it seems incredible, even more in retrospect than it did at the time, that Britain and France should have stood by calmly, their umbrellas on their arms, while the storm broke over their heads. While they looked on, Hitler deliberately went about restoring Germany to and beyond the military greatness which they had thought was shattered forever. It seems clear, now that Walter Millis has established a valuable perspective by assembling all these events in their proper order and with their proper emphasis, that Britain and France thought they could maneuver an armed Germany in directions compatible with their own interests; statesmen in both countries intoxicated themselves with the vision of a Nazi Germany and a Communist Russia smashing head on and automatically removing each other as a threat.

Alongside this was the policy in the early days of permitting Germany to expand because she seemed too weak to bother about, and, continuing the green light policy in the later days because she seemed too strong to bother. On the side of Hitler was perfect timing at every point along the way; on their own side were indecision, ineptitude, and a facility for arriving at barns all over Europe and finding not only the horses gone but frequently the barns themselves.

All this is added up and tallied by Mr. Millis, who has written a book which will save you a lot of time and trouble if you are looking for a concise, compact, not-too-deep history of Europe since 1919. It manages somehow to compress into one volume a story which you might have thought could not be told—and before Millis it has not been told—in less than a dozen books. There is no pretense here to reference-shelf completeness or detailed analysis, and most of what is said has been said before, though not all in one place. What makes *Why Europe Fights* profitable reading is the integration of the material, the marked deftness of the organization, and the relationship, as the author sees it, of events.

they have the basic attempting to per- moded system. The ree that "the cost —today—is an un- rden to the major- ns. But the charity d of our doctors to le the inadequate get, is also a burden The plan suggested, rrecting this condi- ficiently elaborated umerous contradic- h advocating pre- profit medical care Federal and State roponents are ob- phobia of Govern- and insist that their

The Book Forum

Edited by

ELEANOR VAN ALEN

PROBLEM TO THE NORTH

John MacCormac was correspondent for *The New York Times* in Canada from '34 to '39. Stating his case in the first chapter of his book *Canada—America's Problem* (Viking, $2.75) he declares that, by reason of Canada, isolation for the United States is impossible and neutrality a fiction. This book does for Canada—as MacCormac points out—what Duncan Aikman's *All American Front* and T. Y. Ybarra's *America Faces South* did for the Republics of South America.

Writing graphically and with Gaelic humor, Mr. MacCormac devotes the first half of his book to a realistic, and, on the whole, most objective presentation of Canadian foreign policy in the recent past and today. He notes that, up to the outbreak of the present war, the British investment in Canada was far more considerable than in Europe, and that Britain could well turn her back on Europe were it not for complications in India. Such a retreat would leave the British Isles "a cultural and strategic rather than an industrial and commercial outpost." He suggests a division of world leadership between Britain and the United States. The anomaly of Canada's place in world affairs stems, he indicates, from two things, "spiritual dependence on Great Britain," which engenders a Colonial mentality, and "geographical proximity to the United States." The war has granted Canada a temporary unity, but no direction finder for her future.

The real test of unity, he insists, will come at the end of a long war when conscription, against which Mr. Mackenzie King's government has pledged itself, is demanded. In two closely written chapters Mr. MacCormac analyzes that complicated leader, who has been so long self-perpetuating in office. His has been a remarkable career, a triumph of old-fashioned Gladstonian liberalism over New Dealism. Government to him has been "not a business but an art." Mr. MacCormac rates King as above all an uncanny politician, while granting fully the need for such in a country with so large a minority as the French Canadians.

These French Canadians demon-
majority of the peo survival since
lar support, in fact tury of French
third of the total v y a handful of
lowing had declinec the mercies of
vious elections—b y their mother
was able to push a wn, if not al-
way into office. He The Catholic
the hour. ted their na-

It is possible, I mily life, stern
lieves, that Europ assical rather
groped its way to p ducation. In a
the mistakes of stem they pre-
France, despite the problem of a
warlike actions of I ntry.
—if it had not been atest value of
"No one," Millis s keen dissection
finally say just wha ology, and its
thing in history or d international
most responsible," such thing, Mr.
to him the broadest as a Canadian

culture, though there is a sparse French Canadian one. All Canada's art has been derivative save her painting.

Canada, says Mr. MacCormac, is destined to be the air crossroads of the world. He treats, as well, of her wheat fields, mines, fur farms and fisheries. In 1937 Canada stood eighth among countries of the world as an importer and fourth as an exporter. Canadian Big Business is in the hands of a few hundred men, mostly Scotch Canadians, fiercely pro-British. But barely 62 per cent of Canada's business capital is Canadian.

Mr. MacCormac is optimistic about Canada's future. He has performed an outstanding service in illuminating for the people of the United States this nation which is their northern neighbor and, as he says, their problem.

E. V. A.

SPAIN'S CIVIL WAR

Reviewed by Mary Elting

For two and a half years Julio Alvarez Del Vayo watched his countrymen fighting and losing what he calls "the first battle of the Second World War." He saw the western democracies deliberately abandon the Spanish Republic to Hitler and Mussolini. He knew, as even the stubbornest non-interventionist now knows, what faced France and England once the fascists established themselves in Spain: the probable loss of the Mediterranean communications route, the threat to the French flank, the annihilation of a valiant anti-fascist ally. It was melancholy enough for most Spaniards to foresee all this; but Señor Del Vayo's task as Foreign Minister of the Republic was even more painful. He had to meet, and argue with, and be polite to the very creators of non-intervention.

If his story of those tense months had been bitter, no one could have blamed him. There is, however, almost no rancor in his book, *Freedom's Battle* (Knopf, $3). Not even in the passages where he cannot help mourning the cowardice of his fellow-socialist Leon Blum. Although he does not excuse Blum, he believes he was driven by fear that England would not support the French against Hitler, whereas some at

least of the English statesmen permitted the Spanish disaster because they were themselves fascist in sympathy.

The record of Señor Del Vayo's official activities is the most interesting part of his wholly absorbing chronicle. It is the first behind-the-scenes record we have had—a generous, impassioned, yet on the whole well-considered estimate of events and men. If we interpret the present in the light of his experience, the future is not, to be sure, altogether encouraging. Now that Paris has fallen, one cannot help remembering how Madrid held out, and that many of those who are now guiding the democracies made the policy which crushed Spain. Yet Señor Del Vayo's message leaves a feeling that here is a people truly capable of rising again.

VANISHED POLAND

In *There Shall Be No Night*, the current war play on Broadway by militant Robert E. Sherwood, a Polish officer who has fled to fight on in Finland says he has often wondered what it must be like to be an American and feel secure. For, in Polish memory, the sun has always risen on enemies in the morning and set over them at night. The author of these informal memoirs, *Polish Profile*, by Princess Paul Sapieha (Carrick & Evans, $2.50), learnt all about that uncertainty in her six years just passed in Poland as the wife of a Polish prince. She is an American, born Virgilia Peterson.

Sometime before the Nazi invasion, her husband smilingly remarked: "Anyway, it's certainly easier to die for Poland than to live in it." As an intuitive and sensitive American girl, educated in the liberal tradition, she tried hard to make the necessary adjustment to a semi-feudal society. Impressionistically, she recreates that vanished world—the life on an 8,000-acre wooded estate or in a Silesian border mining town, the boar shoots, the medieval Christmas festivals, the aid to the omnipresent poor, the protocol-ridden Warsaw society, and finally her escape after the Nazi invasion. Though this is frank autobiography throughout, Princess Sapieha succeeds in universalizing her experiences, and allows quite openly for her prejudices. Much of Anne Lindbergh's quality of artistry in the imaginative presentation of detail graces *Polish Profile*.

E. V. A.

HEALTH IS WEALTH

Reviewed by Eric M. Matser, M.D., F.A.C.S.

The vehemence and force, the vigor and sincerity which made *Microbe Hunters* and *The Fight for Life* so appealing, characterize *Health Is Wealth* by Paul de Kruif (Harcourt, Brace and Company $2.00). Motivated by a sense of social responsibility and the deep conviction that untold human suffering and economic waste can be avoided by a system of democratic medicine, a small group of Michigan physicians have formulated the "Fundamental Principles of a Non-controversial National Health Program." The story of how this group came into being, the personal chronicle of the authors' unsuccessful attempt to interest Washington in their plan and the reprinting of several articles which have appeared in *The Country Gentleman*, form the basis of this book.

Published when medical reform is rapidly becoming a political issue and when the autocratic reactionary policies of organized medicine are being questioned by the Federal government before the Supreme Court, this forceful plea for a national health program is most timely. In essence, the "Fundamental Principles" are admirable, but in attempting to be "non-controversial" they have the basic weaknesses of attempting to perpetuate an outmoded system. The public will agree that "the cost of medical care—today—is an unsupportable burden to the majority of our citizens. But the charity work demanded of our doctors to give the people the inadequate care they now get, is also a burden to the doctors." The plan suggested, however, for correcting this condition is not sufficiently elaborated and presents numerous contradictions. Although advocating prepayment, non-profit medical care and extensive Federal and State grants, the proponents are obsessed with the phobia of Government medicine and insist that their plan "must provide in every way for safeguarding the relationship of patient and doctor as now existing in private practice." This is the antithesis of the viewpoint of "The Committee on the Costs of Medical care." Dr. Hugh Cabot in *The Patient's Dilemma* emphasizes throughout that the hospital with its laboratories and therapeutic and diagnostic facilities, must form the foundation for modern medical practice, not the office of the individual practitioner.

The enactment of a constructive health program will come about only when the medical and social facts are faced squarely and when all the factions accept the basic truism that modern medicine requires group co-operation. Although there are many weak facets in the program so enthusiastically championed by de Kruif, all will agree with him in the conclusion that "it costs the nation more to let people stay sick and bury them when they die than it would cost to keep them well."

Upheaval in Europe

In the history of Western civilization, probably, few dates will be more important than June 17, 1940. On that day beaten France asked for an armistice. On that day more than France capitulated to Adolf Hitler. On that day the democratic way of life capitulated on the European continent. On that day a new turn came to world affairs.

On November 11, 1918, when Imperial Germany gave up the struggle against the Allies, Democracy triumphed. Yet in many ways the cultural and intellectual pattern of Hohenzollern Germany was similar to that of the Western Powers. The Treaty of Versailles was harsh. Germany lost some territory, her colonies, her army. Nevertheless, the peace allowed Germany to live with a freedom permitting her, after twenty-two years, to destroy one of the nations which defeated her. But the blueprints which Hitler and his aides have drawn up indicate that a new kind of Europe, possibly a new world order, is now in the making. For Hitler heads not only a mighty army, but a revolution, a revolution against the ideals of Magna Carta, of the French Revolution and of our own Declaration of Independence.

Germany Triumphant

On June 17, 1940, with the swastika flying over Paris, with the new French Premier, eighty-four year old Marshal Petain, the man who did not let the Germans pass at Verdun in 1916, suing for peace, Hitler might well have said: "Europe is mine." Only one strong nation under arms, Britain, stood in his way of wider dominion. And, aside from the contest of arms with Britain, only one question remained to be answered: Would Russia, outwardly friendly to Germany, decide that an all-powerful Hitler was a deadly danger and try to contribute to his eventual downfall as she did to the defeat of Napoleon more than a century ago?

On June 17, 1940, the world map seemed destined to be remade. On that day, too, the philosophy of life of hundreds of millions of people seemed certain to be reshaped by Adolf Hitler. Never before in history had one man so much power over so many other men. And as for the German people themselves, the world now remembered fearfully what Hitler, in *Mein Kampf*, had written many years before: "Today there are 80,000,000 Germans in Europe. Only that foreign policy will be correct which assures that in about a century 250,000,000 Germans will live in Europe."

How Hitler Did It

Hitler's victories were the result of seven years of planning devoted to one aim: the forging of a military weapon which would be irresistible; the use of that weapon to overthrow the European order and to erect the Nazi system in its place. For seven years Germany—her youth, her men and women, her factories and fields, her scientists, her money—were mobilized to that end. For seven years an absolute dictatorship barked out orders and was obeyed. For seven years terror and force were used to beat down internal opposition.

For seven years foreign journalists and a few others in Berlin watched and warned; for seven years those in power outside Germany hoped and disbelieved. In general the world miscalculated the energy that was being generated within the Third Reich. With surpassing skill, taking advantage of peace sentiment in the countries around him and of the shortsightedness of his opponents, Hitler moved on from diplomatic to military victory. He occupied the demilitarized Rhineland in March 1936; annexed Austria in March 1938; broke up Czecho-Slovakia between September 1938 and March 1939; annihilated Poland in September 1939, and then in quick succession knocked over Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Holland, Belgium and, finally, France.

The Military Climax

The capitulation of France climaxed ten weeks of stupendous military effort on the part of Germany. On the morning of April 9 the Nazis invaded little Denmark. On the same day, using a Fifth Column within the country and his own mechanized units, parachutists and planes, Hitler's legions drove across Norway. Soon most of Norway was a Nazi province. Unable to stand up against Hitler's tanks and planes, Allied troops were forced to withdraw. The stage was set for the second blow.

It came on May 10. On that day the Germans opened a mighty offensive against the Netherlands, Belgium and France. Once again, with "Fifth Columns," dive bombers and tanks, the Nazi steamroller flattened the enemy. Within five days the Netherlands capitulated. Within eighteen days King Leopold of Belgium surrendered. Allied troops, fighting in Belgium, were caught in a Nazi trap when

RAY—*The Kansas City Star*

Determined to see it through

a German force, driving rapidly across southeastern Belgium, crossed the Meuse near Sedan and then turned toward Abbeville on the French Channel coast. Only an heroic retreat across land and across the Channel saved hundreds of thousands of Allied troops from death or capture. In the meantime, because of the disaster which had befallen the French armies along the Meuse, General Gamelin was replaced as chief of the Allied land forces by General Maxime Weygand.

Hardly had Belgium been knocked out when Hitler, on June 5, giving his opponents no rest, launched his attack on France. Once again bombers and tanks, with more than a million men behind them, smashed all opposition. Outflanking the Maginot Line, the mechanized units crossed the Somme, the Aisne, the Oise, the Marne. The French retreated and cracked. On June 14 the Nazi legions rolled into Paris, the City of Light, the symbol of Western Democracy. On that day too the Nazis took Versailles, where sixty-nine years before, in January 1871, the Prussians, led by Bismarck and Moltke, proclaimed the establishment of the German Empire under William I of Prussia; Versailles, where twenty-one years ago, on June 28, 1919, the cannons boomed and the fountains played to signify the defeat of Imperial Germany. On June 17, 1940, three days after the Germans entered Paris, the end came for France. Premier Reynaud had resigned because he would not yield. His successor, Premier Petain, faced the inevitable and, with a heavy heart, announced that "we must cease to fight."

Italian Sideshow

On Monday afternoon, June 10, a vast crowd gathered in Rome before the Palazzo di Venezia, built in the fifteenth century for Pope Paul II. Benito Mussolini appeared on the balcony and, while the crowds roared, declared that Italy was going to war against France and Britain. Many non-Italians re-phrased his announcement; they preferred to say that Il Duce was stabbing France in the back at a time when that country, reeling from German blows, could not hit back.

For nearly ten months, since the outbreak of war, Italy had remained non-belligerent, but friendly to her axis partner, Germany. By threatening and doing nothing she forced the French and British to deploy large forces in Mediterranean areas. Throughout the months of waiting Mussolini was expected to enter the war when a German victory was certain and then divide the spoils, or as much of them as Hitler would give him. Il Duce put it otherwise in his speech declaring war: "We will take the field against the plutocratic and reactionary democracies who have always blocked the march and frequently plotted against the existence of the Italian people."

Italy brought 4,000 to 6,000 planes into the war against the Allies, and a navy totaling 717,000 tons. Her army, considered the weakest arm of her fighting forces, numbered more than 1,000,000. Italian participation led to no great military actions. But with Italy's war declaration the conflict spread to new areas of the earth's surface: the Mediterranean, Suez, Africa, and Aden, across the Red Sea on the Asian coast.

The World Stakes

Until Hitler's shadow fell across Europe it used to be said that the sun never set on the British Empire. That Empire is one of the most dazzling jewels ever to glitter before a conqueror's eyes. It covers more than 18,000,000 square miles; it is more than six times the size of the United States. Within its borders live more than 500,000,000 people of every race and creed, of every type of civilization. It contains the great lands of Canada, Australia, South Africa, India, New Zealand, Burma, Ceylon. Spread across the earth and waters are British outposts — Hong-Kong, Singapore, Bermuda, Gilbraltar.

Britain's overseas investments, according to the latest available estimates, total 3,700,000,000 pounds. She possesses a merchant marine of more than 10,000,000 tons.

The French Empire, too, spreads across the world's surface. It covers 4,794,000 square miles, and has a population of approximately 110,000,000. The tricolor of France has waved over Algeria, Morocco, Tunis, large parts of West Africa, Madagascar, Indo-China and French outposts across the seas. Like the British Empire, it possesses vast resources. And to these two Empires must be added those of the Netherlands and Belgium, and the possessions of Denmark. For with the swastika flying in Copenhagen, Amsterdam, Brussels and Paris, with Britain's fate in the balance, the future of the world's empires is a question mark.

Undoubtedly, if the conquerors of Europe overcome Britain, they will take over some of these lands. But when Hitler remakes the map he will probably break with orthodox methods just as he has done on the battlefields of Europe. In the Nazi scheme of things, it is said, Germany is to be the center of a new empire—an ideological as well as territorial and economic realm. The outlying regions will have to work for the benefit of the center. In return Hitler will provide bread and circuses. Perhaps Nazi proconsuls will sit in various parts of Europe and the world. At any rate, with Hitler controlling hundreds of millions of people in Europe, and with many non-European areas taking orders from him, he will be able to make his own terms with those who may wish to trade with him.

Thus events underlined the gloomy phrases of Oswald Spengler who in *The Hour of Decision* predicted: "We live in momentous times; the stupendous dynamism of the historical epoch that has now dawned makes it the grandest, not only in the Faustian civilization of Western Europe, but—for that very reason—in all world history, greater and by far more terrible than the ages of Caesar and Napoleon."

Russia

On August 21, 1939, ten days before Germany marched into Poland, Adolf Hitler and Josef Stalin, hitherto violent enemies, threw a bombshell into European affairs by signing a non-aggression treaty. For years Hitler had been preaching a crusade against the Bolsheviks, had called the rulers of Russia "blood-stained criminals" and "the scum of humanity." For years the Communists had looked upon Hitler as World Enemy No. 1. Suddenly Moscow and Berlin were friends.

In September, after Hitler conquered Poland, Berlin and Moscow divided the spoils and thereby established a common frontier. Between September and mid-October, Stalin, taking advantage of Germany's preoccupation in the West, forced the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, to grant military bases to the Soviet. Again on March 13, 1940, in the treaty of peace concluding her war with Finland, Russia achieved frontier changes which improved her strategic position.

On June 15, 1940, while French resistance was collapsing, Moscow moved again. Russian troops marched into Lithuania, and the next day into Estonia and Latvia. The pretext was that the little Baltic countries had violated their agreements with Russia. The real reason, apparently, was Russia's growing fear of Germany. The possibility loomed that an all-powerful Hitler might turn around again and take the rich Ukraine from Russia.

It had been the Soviet hope that the war in the West would last for years with both sides exhausted at the end, thereby paving the way for Communist domination of Europe. For that reason, according to many observers, Russia had failed to join the Allied front against Germany, believing that the Allies alone would be the equal of the Nazis. But, like the statesmen of France and Britain, Russia seemed to have miscalculated Hitler's strength. It seemed as if

SOMDAL—*The Boston Herald*

The Descent of Man

AREAS ANNEXED OR INVADED BY HITLER

Date	*Nation or Territory*	*Population*	*Area sq. miles*
March 12, 1938	Austria	6,500,000	32,000
October 1, 1938	Sudetenland	3,500,000	10,500
March 14, 1939	Czecho-Slovakia	9,500,000	34,000
March 22, 1939	Memel	150,000	830
September 27, 1939	Poland	22,000,000	73,500
April 9, 1940	Denmark	3,750,000	16,575
May 2, 1940	Norway	2,900,000	124,500
May 10, 1940	Luxembourg	300,000	999
May 15, 1940	Netherlands	8,700,000	12,704
May 28, 1940	Belgium	8,400,000	11,775
June 17, 1940	France	42,000,000	212,659

Soviet Russia would be left facing the Nazi colossus alone on the European continent.

The U.S. and the War

The march of the German armies across western Europe resounded louder and louder in American ears as June brought early summer. A sense of apprehension swept the nation, and as fear mounted counsels divided. A minority urged that the United States enter the war immediately, against the Nazis and Fascists. A majority urged that we send all possible material aid, but no men, to the Allies — when France crumpled, to Britain alone. All agreed that the United States, meanwhile, should arm itself wholesale in preparation for the day when war would spread to this hemisphere.

The Roosevelt Administration all along has sought to aid European democracy in the fight against German dictatorship. For that reason it asked—and finally obtained—repeal of the Neutrality Act's arms embargo. The German Blitzkrieg launched on May 10 multiplied the Allied need for American planes and guns. Shipments were speeded, and the Administration went further by sending arms originally intended for American use. This was made possible by a ruling that the government could legally "trade" to manufacturers supplies they would later replace by new stocks.

In word, as in deed, the Administration showed its hand. At the University of Virginia on June 10 President Roosevelt denounced Italy's entrance into the war and declared: "We will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this nation." To a plea from French Premier Reynaud at the moment of France's death agony, Mr. Roosevelt replied: "Every week that goes by will see additional material on its way to the Allied nations."

"What's in it for me?"

Administration policy stirred criticism among isolationists as likely to lead the nation into war. But public opinion polls showed general support for the Administration's activities—so long as they did not plunge the country into actual fighting.

America to Arms

In the public mind, as in the Administration mind, the military disasters in Europe rammed home the danger to the United States. A possible breakup of the British and French Empires, German acquisition of the Allied fleets, Nazi encroachments in Latin America —all shouted aloud that America must spring to arms. The Administration moved rapidly toward military, naval and industrial preparedness. Congress cooperated wholeheartedly and with breathtaking speed.

Bills, suggested one day, were introduced the next, and approved after brief, brisk debate by votes that were practically unanimous. Lightning-fast developments in Europe called for constant revision of plans. In May President Roosevelt suggested increasing the regular army from 227,000 to 250,000. By June the House believed the figure should be 400,000, and a demand was heard for 750,000. Universal military training was proposed in many quarters.

Navy estimates met similar changes. On June 17 the President signed bills authorizing twenty-

two new ships, an 11 per cent increase in naval tonnage, and the Administration requested eighty-four additional ships—a 24 per cent increase. Bills were introduced to make the request law—a first step toward a two-ocean navy. But next day Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, recommended a 70 per cent increase to give the United States the greatest navy the world has ever known.

The Stark recommendation would cost about $4,000,000,000. Already the defense program for the next fiscal year had reached a total of $5,000,000,000 — with more, much more, to come. The mounting costs caused Congress to move for increase of the national debt limit from $45,000,000,000 to $49,000,000,000 and for new taxes that would pay in part for preparedness. These were first steps—first steps only.

Higher income taxes, higher luxury taxes, higher taxes on tobacco, alcohol, soft drinks, theater admissions and other items were proposed, recalling the heavy taxation Americans paid in the World War. Government economy and governmental borrowing would be part of the program. Debate on taxation was brief. Congressmen found their mail bulging with letters from constituents ready to pay higher taxes, and despite the tradition against raising levies in election years, Congress acted.

The defense program had other ramifications. The Administration moved to strengthen the border patrols. It took steps to check up on aliens who might be Fifth Columnists in a crisis. President Roosevelt spoke of compulsory national service—military or civil—for American youth. He nominated Henry L. Stimson and Frank Knox, Republicans, as secretaries of War and of the Navy.

Pipe Down

ORR—*The Chicago Tribune*

Advisors-in-Chief

On Washington's Constitution Avenue stands the Federal Reserve Building, a white temple that looks across Potomac Park toward the Lincoln Memorial's classic pillars. Air-conditioning excludes the capital's notorious summer heat. One of the city's best restaurants is found within the marble walls.

Through the monumental portico now pass national figures drafted to form the seven-member National Advisory Defense Commission. They have moved into the building. Drawn from the nearby War and Navy Departments, a part-time staff aids them in the task of gearing American industry to the needs of national defense. Acting with the commission is a Council of National Defense including the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce and Labor.

The commission's problems are colossal. With only advisory powers, it seeks to standardize such war goods as airplane motors with a view to mass production. It tackles the production of machine-tools, those power-driven drills, lathes and what-not essential to modern industrial output. The accumulation of vital raw materials is before it. The interests of labor and of consumers must be safeguarded.

The commission—its members have been promised a free hand—faces the job of speeding up industry for defense without establishing the sort of dictatorship exercised during the World War by the War Industries Board. Tanks and guns, armored trucks, gas masks, planes, shells—all are familiar needs of a fighting force. But their complex mechanisms are highly important commission problems, since in modern warfare, as in the nursery rhyme, a nation's fate may depend upon the nail in the shoe.

The commission did not have to start from scratch. For years the War Department has been planning for M-Day, when the whole nation will be mobilized for military purposes. War needs have been allocated to various industries. Specifications have been drawn, sent out, to be locked in strong-boxes until the hour strikes. The M-Day studies of American industries provided a sort of census on which the Defense Commission could build.

As the commission got to work, industrial plants began to whirr.

SHOEMAKER—*The Chicago Daily News*

Our Hope for the Future

In Detroit, in Pittsburgh, in Toledo, in scores of little towns over the land, smoke belched from factory chimneys. War orders for our great new military and naval machine were taking hold, and industries that had previously been busy enough with Allied orders started plant expansion to meet a war demand unparalleled since 1918.

South America Menaced

Through the waters of the South Atlantic steamed the American cruiser *Quincy*, bound, it was officially stated, on a "good-will" mission. Events indicated that the voyage was closely related to the problems of hemisphere defense posed so dramatically by German victory on the fields of France. Trouble seemed certain to be brewing in South America.

The rise of Nazi power, even before Europe went to war, caused alarm in Washington lest Fascist penetration into Latin America threaten the interests of the United States. The military position of this country might ultimately be involved, and though few of the Latin American States were full-fledged democracies, a Fascist government in this hemisphere might well threaten the democracy of the United States itself.

The danger was discussed at the Lima Pan-American Conference of 1938, and it loomed last Autumn at the conference held in Panama. It has been behind all discussion of hemisphere defense and our efforts to knit the New World nations more closely. It became more real a few weeks ago with disclosures in Uruguay that resident Nazis had been plotting to seize that Republic and set up an agricultural colony of the Hitler Reich. Other South American nations searched for similar plots, and to complicate things, Brazil's President Vargas indicated an outspoken sympathy for Fascist philosophy in a much discussed speech.

In Brazil are 2,000,000 Germans and 3,000,000 Italians — figures that include up to three generations. Argentina has 250,000 Germans, 3,000,000 Italians. Not all are Fascist-minded, in these and other Latin American countries, but many are, and the spread of Nazi and Italian propaganda has undermined the belief of a great many Brazilians, Argentinians, Chileans and others in ultimate democracy.

For the United States, Mexico is a danger spot close at hand. The German colony has been Nazi-minded, has apparently sought to stir trouble in that uneasy land. The German policy might well be to cause enough disturbance in Mexico so that the United States would be unable to aid other Latin American states in a fight against German penetration.

All-American Trade

At the root of the Latin American difficulty was economics. These countries, largely agricultural, send into the world markets wheat, meat, cotton, coffee, minerals and other natural products that Europe requires and that compete to a large extent with products of the United States. It is hard for the United States to take Latin American products, and therefore to sell its own manufactured goods in that region. The European war, by cutting off the European market, has made hard times for South America while placing its countries in a mood to unload their products anywhere, anyhow — even by barter with Germany should the German market reopen.

To meet this situation the United States is discussing an all-American customs union that would open markets for Latin America. A $2,000,000,000 Inter-American Export Corporation to handle exports was being talked about at the White House, a scheme that would be accompanied presumably by military and naval plans for closer Pan-American union.

The economic problem would take time to solve. There might not be much time to meet the military and naval problems involved in the Latin American position. The dispatch of the *Quincy* to South Atlantic waters seemed to indicate how closely the United States was keeping watch. In Congress there was further action.

Congress was worried about European possessions in the New World—about Dutch Guiana and Curacao, about French Martinique and Guadeloupe and Guiana, about Britain's holdings in the West Indies. It formally resolved that

the United States would not recognize transfer of any part of the Western Hemisphere from one European power to another. The Monroe Doctrine was thus reaffirmed in unmistakable terms.

Japan to Pounce?

Over walled Chungking, temporary capital of the Chinese Republic, Japanese bombers roared repeatedly in recent weeks, swooping down to drop tons of bombs on the ancient city. Buildings cracked, collapsed in clouds of dust. Vessels in the yellow Yangtze that flows past Chungking's steep rock shook with the repercussions of exploding bombs. Hundreds of Chinese died. The bombers kept coming over.

Japanese strategy in destroying Chiang Kai-shek's capital was not wholly clear. In the "undeclared war"—three years old on July 7—many Chinese cities have been reduced to smoking ruin. Chungking has no apparent value greater than that of wasted Nanking or Hankow. But watchers of the Far Eastern scene suspected that Japan's war lords had a psychological motive. They appeared to hope that by destroying the temporary capital they would be destroying Chinese morale, perhaps ending the war that for months has been little more than a stalemate, a costly one to Japan.

The Japanese, moreover, might well have other fish to fry. In the years since Japanese troops marched into China, the world has changed, and in a fashion that might be turned to Japan's advantage. Britain, fully occupied in Europe, has no longer the power to act as a Far Eastern policeman. France has been crumpled by the German hosts. The Netherlands, like France, lies prostrate. The European Nazi-Fascist victors have been in frequent close relationship with Japan.

For Japan the new situation meant that the island empire might be able to dictate a "new order" in Asia that would not concern itself merely with the Chinese millions. Other prizes loomed. The Dutch East Indies, with their rubber and oil and tin, have long been looked upon enviously by the Japanese. On the mainland French Indo-China with its 24,000,000 people, its great rice paddies, its coal and tin and zinc mines, might fall to the Rising Sun.

HERBLOCK—*The Wilmington News*

This much we can do

The peoples of these European dominions waited uneasily while the Japanese, still officially committed to the status quo, moved mysteriously. Waiting, and watching, was the United States, exponent of the Far Eastern status quo, and in mid-Pacific the American fleet remained close to its Hawaiian bases.

War Relief

In the Australian Pavilion at the New York World's Fair seven teams of women knitters staged a knitting marathon a few weeks ago. They were not knitting for fun, but for relief of Allied war victims. How diverse were the organizations represented, their names told: Bundles for Britain, the Queen Wilhelmina Relief Fund, the Belgian Relief Fund, the Colis de Trianon-Versailles, the Finnish-American Relief Fund.

The women purling away at the Fair represented a small part of the great war relief efforts Americans have undertaken. The American Red Cross has sought $20,000,000 to aid women and children, the aged, and all who have suffered war's ravages. President Roosevelt has put his influence behind the Red Cross drive. The 3,700 chapters of the organization have been out gathering dimes and dollars.

As the refugee tide rose, particularly in France, President Roosevelt asked that Congress appropriate $50,000,000 to aid the war sufferers. The Red Cross was to administer this in such a way that it would not duplicate private contributions. Whatever disagreement there might be on military aid to the Allies, on relief, agreement was general.

Arms for America

The United States must set itself for war and is making ready for such a struggle, this military expert believes

BASIL C. WALKER

"GERMANY prepared for this war; France prepared for the last war; Great Britain prepared for no war." In these pithy words, Hanson W. Baldwin, military critic of *The New York Times*, summed up the relative military preparedness of the original European belligerents.

Let us carry his thought a step further: The United States, for the second time in twenty-five years, has to prepare for the next war.

That next war may grow out of the present war, no matter who wins. Our national defense policy and the war plans that give it effect must be based on sound strategy, and geography, world conditions and time determine strategy.

All three strongly influence our first line of defense, the navy. Simply stated, the navy's basic defense is to keep hostile forces from landing on our territory. Incidental to that is the task of preventing hostile interference with our overseas trade and supplies. In September, 1939, only two navies had sufficient strength to threaten our navy's defense mission. One was the British navy, whose basic defense and interest in world trade so nearly paralleled our own that each government left policing of many important areas to the other. British naval strength in and around the Atlantic far exceeded American, but American strength in the Pacific, vital to the British imperial position, greatly exceeded Britain's. Though the fact went unnoticed by most Americans, in the last twenty years world changes made our naval defense in the Atlantic more and more dependent on the tacit co-operation of the British navy.

The other navy capable of menacing our interests was the Japanese. Inferior in total strength to the British or the American navy, nonetheless, in and around the western Pacific, its effective battle strength roughly equals ours. This is because of shore bases, nearby dockyards, and the location of important island screens like the Philippines, the Marshalls, the Carolines, the Netherland Indies, and the Japanese Islands themselves.

By far the greater part of our battle fleet is permanently based in the Pacific, with the principal naval bases at San Diego and Honolulu (Pearl Harbor). If world affairs required withdrawal of any part of our fleet to the Atlantic, every such withdrawal would impair our defense in the Pacific. An Allied defeat, involving German acquisition of either or both Allied fleets, plus shipbuilding facilities in those and in other European countries, would then create a need for withdrawal of our naval strength in some degree from the Pacific.

In place of a co-operative friend, there would then arise on our Atlantic seaboard a potential and aggressive enemy, with the possibility of occupation or domination of Greenland, the Canadian and Newfoundland coasts, Bermuda, and points in the West Indies, Central and South America (all now parts of the British, French or Netherland colonial empires). Three months ago this did not seem an immediate possibility.

Decisive defeat or surrender of the British navy might involve its destruction or very severe damage, to say nothing of heavy losses to the German and Italian navies also. But it is conceivable that a British fleet, much impaired in strength, would retreat to Canadian bases. This would indeed bring the war right to our own coasts.

The probability of these moves is not important. Their mere practicability is the vital fact, arising from world conditions and geography, for the time element runs against us. If such a thing is to happen, it can happen within a year. Our past rates of performance indicate that it would be optimistic to expect an additional American fleet, sufficient to cover both oceans, in much less than four years —which might be three years late.

Our naval problem, stripped of technicalities, comes down to this: Our present strength is adequate for the immediate situation. It is not adequate to meet one which can arise long before we can make additions to our fleet.

The bottleneck of our naval trouble lies in inadequate building and shore establishments. The remedy is substantial appropriations for new building, for yards and for base facilities. Yards and base facilities increase the effectiveness of fighting ships, but should not be looked on as a substitute for increasing the actual strength of the fleet.

The cornerstone of our present naval strategy

is the Panama Canal. The Canal, by making possible rapid shifting of ships from one ocean to the other, goes far to offset a fleet admittedly inadequate to protect both oceans. By the same token, capture, destruction or severe damage to the Canal could seriously impair the fleet's strength. While defense of the Canal from sea attack is naturally included in the general naval defense mission, its local defense is primarily an army and air force function.

AIR force, in the American defense scheme, is not a separate arm. The army and the navy each has its own air force, designed and trained for use as part of the army or the navy, and not as a separate air arm. In principle, although not in form, this conforms to the basic operating plans of the highly effective German air force. That principle is that the function of the air arm is not to fight battles and win victories on its own, but to make it possible for the ground (or the sea) forces to win the final decisions.

It is now agreed that defense of the continental United States is best served by complete hemispherical defense, that is, by "the protection of the whole American hemisphere against invasion or control or domination by non-American nations," to use the words of the President. The principal vital points in this hemisphere are the Panama Canal, Alaska, and the general area New York-New England-Canada-Newfoundland. If attacked, after reasonable warning, on any *one* of these fronts, we are now adequately prepared. But in the new world groupings, we have to be ready to meet attacks by two or more powers, attacking in both oceans at the same time.

A victorious Germany can menace the Greenland-Newfoundland-Canada area. In addition to an aggressive Japan, another important air power, Soviet Russia, has existing establishments within sight of Alaska. Enemies securely based in these areas are within striking distance of such vital American areas as New York-New England and the Pacific Northwest around Seattle. Likewise a victorious Germany and Italy would be close to numerous Atlantic and African bases from which effective attack could be launched on South American and West Indian ports which dominate the Panama Canal and its shipping routes.

Since the fleet could cover only one of these regions in force, we should have to depend mainly on the air arm to keep at a distance a strong attack on any other sector, until the army or the navy could destroy the attackers. The question arises: Is it a function of the army air force or of the navy air force to meet such an attack? Unhappily, the two air forces might not be quickly and effectively co-ordinated. Inter-service jealousy is one of our problems, and it must be disposed of. It is plain that all the army and navy air force available, over and above the air forces operating with the fleet, would be necessary to meet such attacks. There would have to be absolute unity of command and objective.

How many planes would be needed? That cannot be answered until we know how many might attack and where. Not so long ago, 20,000 planes divided equally between the army and the navy was considered a fantastic proposal. Today, sober authorities regard that as an ample, but reasonable, requirement. The present air strength of the army is about 2,800 planes and of the navy about 1,700 planes.

Whatever number we had would be more effective if we had arrangements with Canada, Newfoundland, the republics of Central America, and such nations as Brazil, Colombia and Venezuela for free use of flying fields, and for prior establishment of fueling depots and repair facilities on their territory. The futility of improvising such arrangements after the event is one of the outstanding lessons of the Norwegian, Dutch and Belgian invasions.

It is noteworthy that the South American republics took the lead in denouncing those invasions. They recognized the peril to all of us inherent in the revival of the old barbaric rule that "He shall take who has the power." Since their statesmen have shown us the way, we shall be lacking in vision, courage and a sense of our responsibilities if we fail to take practical defense measures to collaborate with them. We shall not have the British alibi that the menaced nations were afraid to co-operate.

SINCE morale and unity of purpose are vital factors in war, it is not amiss to suggest that due weight be given to economic, political and cultural action to establish a greater community of interest between ourselves and the other American nations. We shall need each other increasingly in the new world order which will certainly come out of the present war, regardless of who may win in Europe.

As for our numbers of planes, rate of replacement is for us more vital than actual present numbers. War will leave the victors with the most modern, tested types of planes. Planned release of some of our planes to the British government will save us from having an air force of obsolescent planes when the crisis strikes. Moreover, to be perfectly cold-blooded about the situation, every contribution made to wearing down German and Italian air power and that of any other allies they may acquire will be a gain against the contingency of attack on us.

Finally, filling large orders for new planes, both for ourselves and Britain, gives the most practical means of turning our overwhelming *potential*

Lithograph by Louis Lozowick *Courtesy of the Weyhe Gallery*

production capacity into actual *realized rate of production* of the most modern planes of all types. Potential capacity is a soothing pipe dream—rate of production is what puts planes where they can destroy the enemy.

In all this tremendous popular interest in air power, we must never forget that final victories on land are won by the army. In numbers, the American army ranks low, but that is not a sufficient test. Rather, the question is: How does our army stack up against its probable defense duties?

The Regular Army should soon stand at 280,000, the present authorized strength. The actual strength was about 240,000 in mid-June, when pending legislation contemplated a new authorized strength of 400,000 men. Out of that force, approximately 50,000 are now used in the Canal Zone, Hawaii, Alaska, the Philippines and Puerto Rico. This leaves about 230,000 men for the entire United States. Competent authorities estimate that 120,000 men are needed for various service troops and permanent garrisons for preservation of government property and for other essential services.

This would leave between 70,000 and 110,000 men as a mobile force, probably adequate on the basis of past assumptions. But those assumptions might turn out to be like certain assumptions under which Great Britain "prepared for no war" —and paid the price in Flanders.

Another angle is presented by the new "Fifth Column" technique. This must now be regarded as a definite and powerful military part of "total war," and likely to be adopted by other aggressors. On our continent, the first attack is likely to be in "internal revolution" in other American nations, fostered by non-American interests, and aimed at establishing powerful bases from which to menace the Panama Canal and vital trade areas.

Effective aid to American governments favorable to our ideals is a contingency which we must be prepared to undertake, if and when the need arises. If we await the event before making ready, we shall be worse off than were the British in Norway. We must now consider that our Regular Army may be called on to furnish expeditionary forces to other parts of the hemisphere, without weakening our home defense.

It is a fact that the President's recent request for authority to use the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, in an emergency arising while the Congress was not in session, was inspired by the War Department. The War Department is believed to have reflected knowledge of just such activities in Latin America as we have been discussing. A very important principle of our defense policy is thrown into focus here.

Our home defenses rest ultimately in the hands of the National Guard and, to some extent, of the Organized Reserves (about 250,000 Guardsmen and 157,000 Reserves), but the National Guard must mobilize around and under protection of a powerful field force of highly trained, well equipped Regular Army troops. Only the gravest emergency, sanctioned by the Congress, justifies moving the National Guard outside the country. The Regular Army should be raised by legislation to the size necessary to furnish a powerful force for home needs and all expeditionary forces likely to be called for in this hemisphere. The ultimate size of the Regular Army should be developed from testimony of army officers before the appropriate committees of Congress, the final decision to be made by Congress.

Keeping in mind the situation in this hemisphere, the forces available in other American countries, and the problem of transporting large

bodies of enemy troops and equipment to this continent, a total authorized strength for our Regular Army of 400,000 men (as against the present authorized strength of 280,000) seems enough. Any provisions, plans or laws looking to a substantially greater figure should be examined most critically, for they would suggest preparation for another great expeditionary force to another hemisphere. Such plans might represent, unintentionally, an undermining of our individual liberties at home. Protection of those liberties is of equal importance as a defense objective to protection of our territories.

In addition to the Regular Army and the National Guard, the other component of the Army of the United States is the Organized Reserves. At present these are preponderantly commissioned officers of various grades, of whom only a minority saw service in the World War. In a major emergency, the bulk of the troops they would command would have to be raised and equipped, in addition to the present strength of the Regular Army and the National Guard. For raising these additional forces, compulsory or selective service is unquestionably the best method, but legislation looking toward such an end must be critically examined by the people and their representatives in the Congress with the reservations suggested above.

Equipment is possibly a more immediate concern than men. We may not need the excessive mechanization of European armies, for our forces may operate in circumstances where mechanization may not be an advantage. The exact technical balance may be left to our professional soldiers. Our people should not be intrigued by mere aping of other armies having different problems, but, equally, senior officers should preserve open-minded realism about modern war. We must prepare for the next war, not the last one.

Our present equipment is far short of modern standards, even for the most limited defense needs. In the entire American Army, we have one mechanized unit, the Seventh Cavalry Brigade (Mechanized), equipped with something over 100 combat cars, which is American Army language for tanks. The army has not quite 400 more tanks, light and medium, but no heavy tanks. A single German armored division (of which there are probably twelve) is equipped with 475 tanks.

It is true that there are 1,000 tanks (light and medium) on order, in addition to armored cars. Similarly, according to the President, 1,700 anti-aircraft guns are "on hand or on order," but according to reliable official data only 463 are actually on hand. Remembering that there should be 280,000 men (and maybe 400,000) in the Regular Army, even though not all are to be equipped with the new Garand semi-automatic rifle, it is significant to note that there are only 40,000 of these rifles on hand. The present rate of production of these rifles is about 1,000 weekly, with hopes of raising the rate to 2,500 weekly. The National Guard (and the new selective service army in a major emergency) would also have to be equipped. These weapons, with their great fire-power, enormously increase the need for ammunition.

This nation has a tremendous industrial production problem to equip its army, and it should not have that problem fogged by confusing things in existence with weapons still on the drafting boards or the order sheets of industry. It is actual rate of production, not potential capacity to produce, that counts.

In defining American defense policy, the American citizen is, and he should never forget or allow his government to forget that he is, the final boss. He must tell the army and the navy, through the Congress, what he wants to defend and under what general conditions he wants to defend it. These are his responsibilities, through the Congress. The army, navy and the President may suggest and advise, but only the Congress should decide.

With this information and these specifications, the army and the navy staffs know what kind of war they must prepare for. The technical complexities are for them, not the citizens, to worry about. The staffs are paid to do that and are a highly capable body of men.

The American citizen must recognize that, while he makes the decision (even by his silence and neglect), some day he must face conditions and policies of other nations beyond his control. Like it or not, this country is the leading power of the whole western hemisphere. As such it has responsibilities for the defense and leadership of the hemisphere. It cannot shirk these responsibilities and remain a free nation.

F. D. R. Must Run Again

One of the President's most ardent supporters marshals the arguments in favor of a third term

SENATOR JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

U. S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania

I AM for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President in 1940, to serve his people and the nation for another term in the White House.

Will he accept the nomination the Democratic National Convention will undoubtedly tender him in July? *He must.* The people are demanding it.

During the summer of 1939, one of the most astute of all Washington political observers, Charles Michelson, veteran political writer and publicity director for the Democratic National Committee, declared it his opinion that the President would prefer a case of hives to four years more of the heartache that being President means. And he added:

"It will not be an easy choice at that. Circumstances might arise that would make it impossible for him to lay down his burden. The world may be at war, with or without threat of involvement; or some other equally acute emergency may eventuate that would forbid change of administration. The man in the White House is not the kind of an individual who would let his personal desire interfere with what seemed to him to be his duty."

Circumstances *have* arisen which make it impossible for Franklin D. Roosevelt to lay down his burden. A deadly and devastating war grips Europe and threatens to spread to our hemisphere.

Roosevelt's call from the people rests not merely upon the demand for a strong man to lead in this hour of emergency, but likewise upon the need for a consolidation and extension of the great social gains he has begun. That he has not already consolidated these gains is not his fault. As a matter of cold political fact, if Roosevelt is elected to the presidency again, he will have an opportunity to serve his first real term of office. Roosevelt's first term, which began in 1933, was canceled, vetoed, by the Supreme Court. His second term, which began in 1937, has been hampered by Tories and political ingrates.

He should, at least, be given an opportunity for four years in the White House with assurance that his program will no longer be torn apart by court decisions or emasculated by selfish interests who have stabbed at him from behind his back.

All should agree that, irrespective of another term for Roosevelt, there must be another term for his ideas. Are there no other Democratic leaders qualified to be President? Of course there are. But where is the candidate that can be trusted to embody and carry forward these ideas and these programs of the New Deal as effectively as President Roosevelt? Regardless of their loyalty for the New Deal, and their zeal in making those principles effective, no New Deal leader can approach Roosevelt in popular appeal or forceful guidance of the people toward his objectives.

The people themselves are answering the question for us. They are saying that so far there appears to be only one to guarantee the continued enjoyment of the many social, industrial, agricultural, educational and cultural gains that have been made under his administration, and that one is Franklin D. Roosevelt himself.

As a practical politician, I say that talk against another term for Roosevelt is bad politics. Those who hold office of trust in the United States government talk with a bad grace of limiting the President to two terms. A quarter of the membership of the Senate has served more than two terms of six years each, and another quarter of the senators are serving their second term—and hoping for a third. Three-fourths of the membership of the House of Representatives are serving a second or more term. Our federal judges are appointed for life.

We need experience in public life, and most of all in the presidency. Will senators who have served from ten to thirty years argue that another presidential term would violate a "sacred tradition" of two terms? Will they contend that it is morally wrong or politically unwise for a President to serve longer than eight elected years? Can senators who have served since the World War convince us that we must get rid of Roosevelt because he has been in the White House since 1933?

Some members of the Democratic party say they have such high regard for President Roosevelt that they feel sure he will not challenge the third-term myth. Some of these men have had such high regard for Mr. Roosevelt that they have balked, filibustered or mutilated some of the President's

measures taken during the last three years.

Let us examine this tradition more closely. It is supposed to rest upon the words and example of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. There was calm, measured logic in Washington's statement of his position on the question. It was outlined in his letter to Lafayette on April 28, 1788, in which he reviewed various issues raised in the Constitution then under discussion. He wrote:

"There are other points on which opinions would be more likely to vary. As for instance on the ineligibility of the same person for President, after he should have served a certain course of years. . . There cannot, in my judgment, be the least danger that the President will by any practical intrigue ever be able to continue himself one moment in office, much less perpetuate himself in it—but in the last stage of corrupted morals and political depravity. . . .

"Under an extended view of this part of the subject, I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the services of any man, who, on some great emergency, shall be deemed, universally, most capable of serving the public."

Such was the final judgment of the Father of His Country, the first President. Jefferson favored a single term of four to six years, yet he served two terms totaling eight years. He admitted that he might serve three terms under certain conditions, and he controlled presidential policy for sixteen years after he left office.

The two-term tradition is a political taboo which we should have discarded long ago. As Jay Franklin has said:

"Freedom from taboos in every other walk of life than politics has been responsible for much of our national progress. The Third Term Taboo is only a lamp which should have been puffed out long ago, just to show that we could do it. The common sense of politics is to keep a good man as long as he is useful and to get rid of a bad President as soon as his incapacity is evident."

WE have modified many of our political practices as the Republic grew and needs changed. We changed our Constitution to collect a federal income tax. We elect United States senators by direct vote of the people, instead of by legislatures as was the custom for more than a century. We have given women the suffrage—against the howls of those lovers of tradition who declared we should not shake off this taboo against women exercising this fundamental right of citizenship. We have seen the Supreme Court recently follow the will of the people in social legislation rather than stick to archaic constructions of law.

Traditions have no validity except when the value of their fundamental premises remains unimpaired. Jefferson feared that America might have a king if a third term were permitted, making exception only of Washington and himself. If monarchy threatens America, then his reasons hold. But who believes that a monarchy would be possible in the United States today?

If traditions had never been broken, George Washington and the Revolutionary patriots would never have taken up arms. Abraham Lincoln would never have freed the slaves.

SURELY, then, we need not cling to a tradition that, in these times of crises in world affairs, has no rhyme nor reason for continued existence.

I favor another term for President Roosevelt as an American. I know what he has done to save America, our people, our peace, our free institutions, our faith in God and man.

I favor another term because I am a liberal and I believe in democracy. Our people realize the real issue. The real fight we face is between liberalism as represented by Roosevelt and reactionary Toryism as represented by judges and lawyers who cheated the people out of the benefits of Roosevelt's leadership in his first term and the ingrates and "middle-of-the-roaders" who have tried to stifle his program in his second term. The people want our liberal democracy to continue. They know that Roosevelt alone can insure its safe continuation.

These are dangerous and critical times. We can afford nothing but our very best man in the White House. What other man than Roosevelt could match the dignity of a king and queen, representing us as their hosts in a manner that made the whole nation proud of him, and at the same time know and feel the problems of the unemployed miners of Pennsylvania and the hardships of the struggling farmers of the Middle West?

In these times of real danger to America—danger from within and from without—we need a real leader, someone who can really represent our democratic will to survive. And we know that in Franklin D. Roosevelt we have such a leader.

But, some may contend, the President may seize the power to make himself a dictator, particularly with his increased emergency powers in this crisis of national defense. Such a fear has been deliberately fostered at other times in our history, in order to thwart the will of the people. The hollowness of this pretense is easily seen. If the President might seize dictatorial powers, it is obvious that he could do so as easily in the first and second as in the third term. If the people of their own volition give more power to a President, they still operate within the framework of democracy. They cannot give him power beyond that permitted under the Constitution. No matter how often the people elect a President, they still control his operations and the boundaries of his duties, through their elected representatives—in the Congress.

It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to argue that Franklin D. Roosevelt would seek to become a dictator. Such a position could be defended only on the ground that the people are not able to govern themselves, that Congress and the courts may be expected to abdicate their functions and prerogatives, and that President Roosevelt himself would seize by force of arms authority not granted him by the Constitution and the people.

As Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes has said: "Our democracy does not rest upon any such flimsy foundation as those who persist in invoking the 'sacred tradition' would have us believe. Our institutions are firmly founded upon the ultimate right of the people to decide for themselves whom they wish to have to serve them and the manner in which they shall be served.

"If the people can give, the people can also take away. If they can be trusted to elect a President for one or two terms they can be trusted to decide for themselves whether they want a President to serve them for three terms. In the final analysis, the safety of our institutions depends upon the ballot box and, so long as we safeguard that right, so long will our nation be a free, self-governing democracy. . . .

"Moreover, it should be remembered that the presidency is not a despotic office but is responsible to an alert and independent Congress. No matter how long a President might remain in office, he would still be subjected to the democratic processes, checked by the Congress and the judiciary, and exposed to the watchful eyes of a critical free press."

Can any "danger" of another term for Roosevelt compare with the risk we run of having forced upon this country a figurehead, a stuffed shirt, an incompetent middle-of-the-roader, or a young and inexperienced man? Everyone in America knows that we need now as never before a man with mature knowledge of the world, knowledge of America, the ability of leadership, determination and courage. Can any political fixers who would oust Roosevelt on the pretext of a tradition fail to believe that if they do they will be branded throughout this country as the professional embezzlers of the rights of a free and democratic people?

We Americans know that to our people Roosevelt is not just a name in the papers, as are other possible candidates for the presidency. Almost every American old enough for school has by this time actually seen President Roosevelt. He has seen and been seen by more of our people than has any other man in the United States.

The people do not want shadow candidates now. They want Roosevelt, because they trust him and his leadership. They demand that the leadership he has given them since 1933 be continued.

Who is supporting President Roosevelt for a third term? The farmer whose land was saved by the New Deal, the factory worker who got decent hours and working conditions and the right to stand up and bargain with his employer like a man, the share-cropper of the South, the migratory worker of the West, the honest business man who has been saved from bankruptcy, the men out of a job who got relief work on self-respecting terms, the old people who got pensions, the citizens who are the beneficiaries of a greater social justice.

President Roosevelt has said: "The social and economic forces which have been mismanaged abroad until they have resulted in revolution, dictatorship and war are the same as those which we here are struggling to adjust peacefully at home."

The amazing energy and courage with which Franklin D. Roosevelt has met the challenge which leaders of countries now at war failed to meet is demonstrated by headlines from almost any daily paper.

"Federal public assistance benefits 17,880,000 persons. . . . . C.C.C. provides useful work and training for 2,000,000 youths. . . . P.W.A. makes possible eighty per cent of all construction in the United States. . . . Government interest rates lowest in history. . . ." and so on through countless daily news dispatches.

These headlines tell a doubly significant story. First of all, they indicate the tremendously wide influence which the idea that "something is going on in Washington" has come to play in the daily routine and normal life of everybody in the nation. Social security, new as it is, has become an established fact of American life. So it is with measure after measure inaugurated by President Roosevelt. There could be no greater tribute to the soundness of these measures than that their application has become a matter of course. Furthermore, the American citizen accepts them as his right. The New Deal is made up of rights guaranteed the citizen unrecognized by his government before 1933. He wants those rights continued — with President Roosevelt still in command.

I recognize this movement for another term as the most remarkable development I have experienced in my forty-four years of practical politics.

It is a movement not sponsored by newspapers, nor by political leaders meeting in back rooms to "put Roosevelt over" for the nomination soon to be made. It is a demand on the part of the people for the victorious completion of his program, and for continued leadership in the time of gravest international crisis since 1917.

All that can be said against another term is that it has never been done before. To which I answer that we never had such conditions to be remedied before. We have never had such leadership before. We did not have Franklin D. Roosevelt in the White House before 1933.

Embattled Darkness

After Armageddon, says this noted writer, little will be left of capitalism, imperialism, and political democracy

VINCENT SHEEAN

(The nature of war in general, of this war in particular, is analyzed in this article and the one which follows. Vincent Sheean is one of America's most brilliant journalists. James Truslow Adams is one of its ablest historians.)

THE present war in Europe does not resemble any such conflict observed by me during the past fifteen years. In various expeditions as a journalist I have seen the conditions, and sometimes even the activities, of warfare, but it was always warfare of a certain kind: that is, it consisted of strong popular movements being opposed by strong reactionary forces. As I look back over my journalistic experience I cannot think of any other kind; I do not think there has been any other kind for twenty years, with the exception, perhaps, of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. That was a military and nationalistic conflict. The others have been chiefly movements of the people, encountering repression. Such was the case in China in 1927, when the great popular revolution was faced by the old-time war-lords with foreign support. The Riff war (1925), my first, was a revolt of the people, suppressed by Alfonso XII's Spain. The Spanish Civil War, my last, was a great popular movement being crushed by reactionary forces with foreign support. In Palestine I saw the Arabs, maddened by Zionist claims, running amok; in Egypt, Austria and even in Paris I have seen minor disturbances of the same sort, arising from the people and repressed from above. This seems to have been, on the whole, the characteristic warfare of the period, both on a large scale (as in Spain and China) and on the smallest scale, such as in the various riots in Vienna and Paris.

The present conflict is one for which my own experience gives me no light at all. Even if I had been old enough to go through the last great war, that of 1914-1918, I doubt if I should know any more about this one. It seems to me that those who argue by analogies with the war of 1914-1918 fall into even greater fallacies than those who ignore it.

This is—unlike all the disturbances of the past fifteen years—a political war. That is, it does not arise from any great movement among the masses of the people. It is not a social conflict. The only emotion among the masses to which it can make any appeal is the emotion of patriotism—a feeling which has been so shamelessly exploited on all sides that it no longer has the hold it once did upon ordinary people.

The Germans, it is true, seem to be actuated mainly by a national despair, into which the semi-sexual and semi-narcotic needle of National Socialism has injected some drug of maniac hope. Except for this one nation there does not seem to be a popular movement at work at all. The war was brought on by a series of political events, political manoeuvers and diplomatic exchanges which were (as always) incompletely understood by the people, and, in fact, incompletely reported to them. The words "freedom" and "democracy," which figure so prominently in the discourses of some leaders, are in fact taken over, along with a great deal more similar verbiage, from the language used during 1936-1939 by those who wished France and England to engage in a policy which might have averted this present war. Thousands of people all over the world distrust such words. And this natural distrust, which grows stronger instead of weaker, is again faced with a contradictory feeling which is equally widespread: viz., that a Europe dominated by Hitler would be even worse. Meanwhile, on the margins of a struggle, there operates the incessant vulpine intelligence of the Kremlin always craftily watching.

I think one would have to be practically half-witted to have any strong hope of a "solution" to the present European problem. What solution can there possibly be? Undoubtedly for the British Empire to surrender eastern Europe to Germany and Russia would be suicide. Germany and Russia in control of those vast, productive areas would very soon be in a position to challenge British world position.

It would be equally suicidal for Hitler to attempt to make peace on any lesser terms.

The example of Poland is very present to the

minds of eastern and southeastern Europeans.

What can Rumania expect?

Has Hungary any real or permanent interest in opposing the progress of a force which many inhabitants of that part of the world regard as destined to rule?

THE radio in Europe was always untrustworthy; it has now become absolutely worthless as a guide to what is really happening.

Germans and English alike have over-ridden the so-called neutral rights which from the outset of this war, and for several years before the war, had been passing into oblivion. We cannot doubt that all small neutral countries will disappear when this is over. It was always in the logic of history that this should be so, and everything that has happened since 1936 suggests that their hour has struck. In a rationally organized Europe, if such a thing ever exists, the small neutrals would have their place as autonomous members of the federated union, but as subdivisions of rabid nationalism they are contrary to economic and social principle, inimical to progress as a whole, and geographically accursed.

Insofar as he has taken the lead, with the utmost brutality, in the destruction of the patchwork of nationalisms, Hitler's movement—particularly since it accepted the *Lebensraum* theory as its chief political notion—has been historically progressive. By accident, of course, and for the narrowest reasons of tribal egoism, but historically progressive just the same.

So we go on to a continent which seems to be in its death struggle. I believe the struggle is only beginning, and that we have yet to witness, year after year, the long, agonizing transformation of a whole culture. The nations of Europe are in embattled darkness. When they emerge, years from now, into the incalculable beginnings of a new culture, I think there will be little or nothing left of the old structures of capitalism, imperialism and political democracy.

No realization of this historic probability is expressed in authoritative circles in France and England, and the most discouraging thing, intellectually, is that the British like their recent ally, the French, seem to have nothing to propose. We know the world order that Russia and Germany desire. We have not the faintest idea of what world order the French and British want, or whether they realize that a new world order is necessary at all or not. By the time they wake up to the necessity, it may be too late for them—and by the same token, for the United States of America, in spite of its much over-praised oceans.

One thing is sure: the masses of the people in Europe have never wanted war. It comes upon them like the Black Death and they do not know why.

AN Italian, a steward on a transatlantic liner, who has been trying for a good many years to get to America, and appeared to have a chance last summer before war descended on Europe, said to me recently: "Qui si sacrifica, si sacrifica, si sacrifica, senza fine e senza speranza." The phrase sounds, in English, so literary that it may not be believed, but even so it is what the man said, with the sadness of a whole race: "Here we sacrifice ourselves, and sacrifice and sacrifice, without end and without hope."

Civilization Cannot Die

In spite of the setback of wars and other world calamities the history of man has always recorded progress

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

THERE are those who claim that this war will "end civilization," and others who believe that the vast upheaval may usher in a new and better world order. An historian may well beware of prophecy and in this brief article I prefer to lean heavily on the past rather than to try to penetrate the future.

First let us note that if history teaches anything, it shows us how tough a creature is man. Individual men and civilizations grow and die, but man and civilization continue. We are apt to think of life in terms of our own and those of our friends, and of "civilization" as the particular culture we have known and made ourselves at home in. History proves constantly that a group or class instinctively feels that civilization and the good of the whole are in danger if its own interests and ways are threatened.

It is easy to point to the destructiveness of wars and even how they have overturned civilizations, although not so easy to prove they were the sole cause of the latter. It is an open question whether the fall of Rome was due to the entry of the barbarians or whether their entry was due to a deterioration in Rome itself. Causes in history are complex, and if wars have sometimes destroyed one form of society they have also been instrumental in building up another and better.

Consider changes in weapons, for example. In the 13th century the Welsh invented the long bow, soon taken over by the English. The effect was to strengthen the democratizing influences in society by making the yeoman with this bow the equal of the knight in armor. A couple of centuries later the use of gunpowder was to revolutionize the social and political system. The great feudal castles no longer served as fortresses from which their owners could overawe either king or people. As the feudal nobility saw their power crumbling like their walls they may well have believed that the end of civilization and order was in sight, yet can anyone believe that the feudal system was better than what developed after its fall?

War has always had great social and political impacts, and its influence has often been beneficial. It has tended to increase the control of the people through the power of the purse, and to hasten social movements, such as woman suffrage in England in the last war or the rise of labor in wages and living standards, as well as political influence. I am not trying for a moment to defend war but merely coldly to analyze its effects. I think history teaches that with all its horrors and destruction, war has also, in our curiously complex rise from a cell in the primordial slime to what we are today, been one of the moving forces to set us ahead as well as often to push us back.

History may be, as Gibbon said, "the register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind," but it is also the story of the most marvellous rise of any sentient creature in the universe, so far as we know. That rise has been steady and increasingly rapid for millions of years, though not always continuous. Taking the race as a whole, we have gone ahead and slipped back, to pick ourselves up and go yet farther ahead. A graph depicting the ascent would be full of jogs and sometimes broken ends but it would go up in one long line. If we could study it in detail we would find one of its characters in a multitude of shifts, for change is the only constant.

To detail the changes would be to write a universal history, but we may note a few points in the last century and a half. If a person, even well-informed, will study historical maps of Europe for that period I think he will be surprised at the vast and incessant alterations in the boundaries of the leading countries. Again, looking at the world, we find that, after her defeat in 1783, England was thought to be broken but within a century she had gained a greater empire than ever and was at the height of her power and prestige. Five generations ago it was France under Napoleon which was threatening every nation in Europe, and William Pitt was saying that Prussia was "the last bulwark of its liberties." In the last generation it was Germany, as it is today. There was a complete shift.

History does not repeat itself in details, in wars any more than depressions. There always appear new factors to complicate the pattern. The civilian war of our century is different from the purely military wars of the 18th. Our industrial civilization is not only more complex but perhaps less

stable than the old agricultural one. The weapons are more deadly. But human nature has not wholly changed in any country, and we may recall that, as Napoleon, against whom nothing seemed likely to stand, widened his conquests he steadily weakened the foundations of his power, till at last he fell.

I do not minimize the dangers of the present situation. I am no Pollyanna. The future is grim, and may well be for the rest of the lives of my generation and the next. There will be great shifts and changes, hard adjustments for individuals and whole classes, but that does not mean that civilization will be destroyed.

It will be altered, whoever wins the war. If the dictators win, it will be set far back, but I do not believe they can permanently control the several hundred millions who still believe in liberty, though the conquerors could deliver staggering blows to all we have held dear. If civilization has become more unstable it has also become more wide-spread. The seeds of freedom have been blown to all quarters of the earth, and libraries of accumulated learning are scattered by the thousands. As I have pointed out, the tempo of man's advance has grown ever swifter through the ages. We may see a set-back lasting for several generations but I do not believe, whatever happens, we are in for a blackout of centuries.

All this may be scant comfort to us who walk the earth today and may be gone tomorrow, but it does not destroy my belief in the future of this strange thing man. I live in dread of the news each day, and I have no illusions as to "peace in our time," in the broad sense, but I still believe that man is not through, that the advance of the last century is not his final leap into a void. Change, unceasing change, will continue to be his lot, but somehow along its line are scattered the evidences of a direction upward,—the flint implements of the stone age, the inventions of wheel and lever, the religious dawnings in his soul, the intellectual questionings of the Greeks, the development of the aesthetic sense, the growth of morality, the beginning of humanitarianism, the sense of fellowship, the rise of science, and the birth of liberty. What would these signify in a chaotic world of chance, even in the struggle for existence of the Java Ape Man?

And so, I believe the race is going on, and that whatever dark age, short or long, may lie immediately ahead, our destiny is not yet fulfilled. Humanity has had to fight its way past many Hitlers and Stalins, and mass emotions in its long history, but the upward urge is cosmic. It is greater than any individual or the events of a generation. If we think in terms of self the future may be dark indeed, but the future of the race still is shining with possibilities, and perhaps all we can do is to contribute to those, by keeping the light of the free spirit burning in every corner of the world we can.

What's YOUR Opinion?

A monthly department conducted by George V. Denny, Jr., founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air and President of Town Hall, New York

The Debate this month:

SHOULD WE HELP THE BRITISH NOW?

For the affirmative: **DR. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, author and professor of Government at Williams College.** *For the negative:* **NORMAN THOMAS, Socialist candidate for President of the United States.**

Dr. Schuman:

IT is precisely in periods of cruel disasters and great decisions that men and women everywhere are moved to search their hearts in order that they may rediscover the fundamental values by which they live. The core of these values among those who still believe in men is the brotherhood of man. Affirmed by Confucius and Buddha, expounded by the Hebrew prophets, lived for and died for by Jesus of Nazareth, this faith stands as the rock upon which all religion, all morality, all decency and dignity, all justice and wisdom in human relations have been painfully built by the tears and blood of all who have fought the good fight against savage tribalism and intolerance.

This concept of human comradeship is the soul of all that is best in Western culture. It is the deep truth of Roman Catholicism. It is the life of modern Protestantism. It was the inspiration of Magna Carta, of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, of the Declaration of Independence, the American Constitution and the Gettysburg address. It is in the Covenant of the League of Nations. It is the goal of "Union Now."

For this Germany's greatest philosopher, Immanuel Kant, published his essay "Toward Eternal Peace" a century and a half ago. For this Italy's greatest poet, Dante Alighieri, dreamed and hoped seven hundred years ago. For this the builders of the French Republic, the British Commonwealth and the United States worked and gave their all in order that faith in man might live. For this in our generation men have died in China, in Ethiopia, in Spain. For this men are dying now in Poland and England.

What is "the brotherhood of man"? A spiritual imperative. A social aspiration. A hope of seers and prophets. An ideal often broken by the ancient bestiality that lingers on unknown in each of us. If it were no more than this it could well be dismissed in this bloody hour by those who have forgotten the past or not yet learned to know the future. But it is more than this. In the Twentieth Century it is an inescapable fact of world economics and world politics—a fact which few feel in their hearts but which nonetheless shapes the destiny of all who live on this crowded and unhappy planet. The world is one. Peace is indivisible. In Woodrow Wilson's words, any war anywhere has become everybody's business.

Those who deny or ignore this fact do so at their peril. The world's tragedy of our time springs from the vain affirmation of many men that they are not their brother's keeper and from the futile hope of some that they can safely ignore the sufferings of others. Time has shown the folly of these beliefs even to those who too long permitted the voice of conscience to be stilled by the dictates of a false expediency.

"I must still hold on," said Haile Selassie four years ago, "until my tardy allies appear. If they never come, then I say prophetically and without bitterness: 'The West will perish.' "

His allies never came. The Western democracies (and America as well) helped Fascism conquer Ethiopia and Spain and China and other victims of brutal assault. Their leaders said that this was the road to "peace." But the delegate of Haiti at Geneva spoke more truly: "Let us never forget that one day we may be somebody's Ethiopia."

That day has come. America's tragedy springs also from the feeble and futile hopes of some

Americans that they could live alone and like it, that they could safely turn their faces away from the martyrdom of others and continue in smug security to keep their own way of life. Time has shown the folly of these beliefs even to the blind pacifists and isolationists who misled themselves and their fellows into disaster. Only a few now remain to raise their voices in behalf of an "isolationism" that is as stupid and dangerous as it is immoral. One of the bitterest ironies of our day is that the most eloquent of these voices should be that of the great liberal and the once great minister of the gospel who is the presidential candidate of the American Socialist party. Socialism means world brotherhood. Liberalism affirms that mankind is one. Christianity stands for the fraternity of all. Yet on March 28, 1940, in the "City of Brotherly Love," Norman Thomas, the acknowledged Christian leader of liberal Socialism in the United States, could say without shame to a crowded hall and to the vast radio audience of America's Town Meeting of the Air: "There won't be any invasion of America that will worry me half so much as a chance of my boys having to go to France." Thousands shamelessly applauded. As if their boys could live any life worth living in America in the midst of a world which America had surrendered to the barbarians!

At this same gathering this writer was roundly booed for saying: "The American frontier lies on the Rhine." Within a fortnight came the rape of Denmark and Norway. There followed the murder of Luxemburg, The Netherlands and Belgium. There followed the onrush of the destroyers into France. And today, save for a handful of the blind, no American doubts that the frontier does lie precisely on the Rhine and on the Thames as well. All Americans hope desperately that the frontier on the Thames can somehow or other be held, lest all of us be done to death by those who seek across a narrow sea to smash through the last bastions of Western civilization.

This is no cheap figure of speech. The warlords of nihilism are not so mad as to deny the unity of the world, however much their creeds of racial and class hatred may deny the brotherhood of man. "Today we have conquered Germany," sang the Nazi Storm Troopers in 1933; "tomorrow the world is ours." The brute power of totalitarianism does not threaten some remote part of the globe (to quote Chamberlain before Munich) "because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing." It threatens all the planet. It threatens the Americas as they have never before been threatened. The fancied security in which their peoples concocted isolationist mythology rested always on the control of the Atlantic by the navy of a friendly Britain. Once that barrier is gone, America will be pitiably helpless before a conqueror who uses arms wherever arms cannot reach him and who elsewhere uses weapons against which arms are useless.

The consequence of Nazi victory now is as clearly predictable as were the consequences of earlier Nazi victories. The conquest of Britain as well as France by the Third Reich would be followed almost at once by the swift penetration of Latin America by a German-Italian-Japanese coalition

and by the prompt reduction of the United States to such a condition of enraged helplessness as to threaten defeat in war, the triumph of hatred and tyranny in "peace," and the end in either event of all the values Americans hold most dear.

These dangers can yet be met. Fifty American "flying fortresses" could have turned the tide at the Meuse and in Flanders. Five hundred American planes could have saved Paris, but Paris is lost.

Now if Britain is lost as well, neither 5,000 planes nor 50,000 will save America. Now that France is lost, Britain can yet be saved and must be saved for America's safety. To save America with France and Great Britain done to death would prove a task beyond our powers, great as those powers are. In a totalitarian world there would be no security and no future for America. There would be "no war on poverty," for America would be crushed by a burden of futile armaments into such poverty as no one now conceives of. There would be no chance to "make democracy work." Fear and want would breed despotism. There would be only a panic flight into darkness before the horsemen of the Apocalypse. Those who foresee such a future foresaw this present and foresaw the recent past. Woe to those who cry for silence and

think only with their blood or their blind desires!

Our one last hope lies in immediate material and military aid to Great Britain.

Such aid, if extended generously and at once, may yet suffice. If it is withheld out of cowardly hopes of safety through escape, America will suffer the fate reserved to those who seek to save only their own skins and who end by losing all. No free people ever lost its freedom by fighting to defend its freedom. Freedom is lost only by refusing to fight or by fighting too late.

If aid is granted now the Western way of life may yet survive the onslaught of the nihilists. Survival does not mean salvation. It means opportunity. The opportunity to build a new world order may be thrown away as isolationists everywhere once threw it away. Whether it is used or lost is for the men of tomorrow to say. The task of today is to create that opportunity by insuring victory. Without victory there can be no survival for those who still have faith in men. And without survival the brotherhood of man will be forever lost in the night to come. There need be no night—if America will act.

Mr. Thomas:

THE wording of our question, in strict fairness, should be: "What, if any, *further* aid should the United States government give to Great Britain?" Of course the United States is now giving enormous aid. First, by keeping the main power of its fleet in the Pacific, where it gives protection to British imperial and commercial interests far greater than any of our own. Secondly, by the disguised subsidy of our gold purchase plan. This amounts to an aid of hundreds of millions of dollars annually, none of which goes to Germany and most of which goes to the British Empire because of its great sales of gold. Our gold purchase plan, as Professors Graham and Whittlesey have brilliantly shown in *The Golden Avalanche*, represents loss, and only loss, to us, except in so far as any one may consider its aid to Great Britain valuable to us.

Finally, we deliberately helped Great Britain by changing our Neutrality Law after the war had begun. The law which we changed was, contrary to general opinion, more favorable to the Empire which commanded the seas than to Germany which did not. We made sure that this advantage to the Allies was definitely increased by removing all restrictions on the sale of any sort of military equipment whatsoever, provided the purchaser could pay for it and transport it himself.

Under these conditions, it is completely false to say or to suggest that it has been lack of American economic aid which has been responsible for the plight of England and France. The most conservative estimate put Allied purchasing power in the United States at thirteen billion dollars, and Great Britain and France have been purchasing at the rate of less than a billion dollars a year. The advocates of further aid must say plainly what sort of aid they favor, and how it would help.

Moreover, there is a great burden of proof upon them to show that further aid will not lead straight to war. Indeed, in my rather extensive experience in debating this issue, I have yet to find one prominent advocate of qualified American intervention, short of military participation, who has not, sooner or later, admitted that, under certain very probable conditions, he would favor our entering the war. Many advocates of aid admit that their only reason for stopping short of urging military aid is that the people are not yet ready for it. Through gradual steps they hope the people can be led to war. There is much in the record to suggest that the President of the United States is of this mind.

However this may be, it is to fly in the face of logic and popular psychology to suppose that one nation in a great war has full command over the degree of its participation, once it decides to get partially in. It is to fly in the face of the history of the World War to hold that Americans can invest their treasure in a war, and not, under certain probable contingencies, also invest the lives of their sons. It is to ignore common sense to propose that we can give England airplanes and not have Germany regard it as a declaration of war.

On the testimony of American experts concerning the number and condition of our effective planes, it is extraordinarily doubtful how much good those that we think we could spare would do to the hard-pressed English. In one way or another, Hitler's drive will be decided before we can give decisive aid with or without a declaration of war. It is at least conceivable that we might find ourselves at war with Hitler and, in that case, quite probably with Japan, even if England, as well as France, decided to make a separate peace.

Definitely we shall have to abandon the illusion, dangerously nurtured by President Roosevelt, that by steps short of war, or without sending troops abroad, we can decide the fate of the world. It is barely possible that we could bring the war to a reasonably victorious end before any troops were sent, but no responsible statesman could contemplate a declaration of war without immediately following it up with wholesale militarization of Amer-

ica and raising vast armies. We could not afford to repeat the mistakes of Great Britain in dealing with totalitarian war.

Our discussion, therefore, logically turns on the question, "Should we enter the war on the side of the British?" If I answer this question with an emphatic negative, it is by no means because I am neutral in my sympathies or indifferent to the fate of Europe. Whatever happens in Europe is bound to have repercussions in America. A complete Hitler victory would, of course, have political, economic and cultural aspects which would greatly add to our difficulties in making our own democracy work. Even if this were not so, decent men would find the world a sorry home if Nazi totalitarianism with its glorification of brute force, intolerance and Machiavellian deceit should become dominant in Europe.

Why, then, am I so opposed to American entry into the war? Because of the nature of modern totalitarian war, and the character of our potential allies and our own government. If America had the power and wisdom of God we should intervene to straighten the affairs of Europe and Asia. We have neither the power nor the wisdom, and the methods of war which we would be obliged to use would entail the sacrifice of our own democracy for an indefinite period. Fascism would win in this last great area where democracy might have been made to work—even if by our participation in war we should conquer particular fascist dictators.

I have admitted the dangers of a Hitler victory. I do not think that they include the invasion of the United States. Before that could be brought to pass, Hitler would have to reorganize a sullen and hungry Europe. He would have to gain the acquiescence of the German people, who have accepted one war about which they were not enthusiastic, but might hesitate to accept the second war before enjoying the expected fruits of their victory. Then Hitler would have to make sure that his uneasy—and equally ruthless—ally, Stalin, would not turn against him.

Only then could he turn his attention to finding means sufficient to transport all the men and supplies that mechanized war requires. These, more and more, he would have to land in a country which, according to military experts, has only five ports capable of handling such a landing. He would have to land them in the face of strong coast defenses and a very powerful navy, for it is inconceivable the British navy will be surrendered to him.

President Roosevelt's famous time table for airplanes is correct enough for tourist travel, although he might have landed his tourists at least as far up the Mississippi as Minneapolis! But effective use of airplanes in war requires bases; thirty ground men and two pilots to a plane is the reasonable allotment. How, in any near period, could Hitler establish them, complete with supplies, machine shops and so on, at the points which the President named?

I shall be told that the real danger is not direct invasion, but Fifth Columns and Trojan Horses in Latin America. Doubtless there is some real danger, but of all ways to overcome that danger the worst would be for the United States, already under suspicion as the "Colossus of the North," either to go to war or to arm herself for such total war as to make her a threat to every country in this hemisphere, rather than a protection. It is by the cultivation of friendship and cooperative action that this hemisphere can be saved. The President

has already lost an opportunity which he should have taken early in the war to get a calm but firm statement from the Pan American Conference, not about an impossible 300-mile neutral zone around this hemisphere, but about our united objection to naval bases in the Caribbean or to transfer of colonies between European powers in this hemisphere. It is a loss which may be retrieved.

Once it might have been necessary to argue that we would lose democracy in the event of war, but no one who sees the extraordinary extent to which hysteria has already gone against aliens and all sorts of suspects can doubt that at war American civil liberties would not last anywhere as long as they lasted in England. The war, no matter with what apparent enthusiasm it might be entered, would be extraordinarily unpopular, and misunderstood by people who would have to fight thousands of miles from home. Hence it would make it more necessary than in Europe for the government to carry on by an intensification of propaganda, censorship and conscription. From the psychological and practical effects of these methods we should be a long time recovering. Especially is this true since we are already at the end of the epoch of a more or less liberal individual capitalist democracy. No military victory can restore the old Europe and preserve the old British type of culture, capitalism and imperialism. At war America will get collectivism in its worst, that is, in its military form. We shall have lost the one chance to render the greatest service we might have given mankind, that is to say, to make democracy work by conquering poverty while still preserving lib-

erty. No Hitler victory can make that task as impossible as can our participation in war.

Our emotions must not obscure the truth that, while the worst fate that could overtake Europe would be a Hitler victory, a Hitler defeat of a magnitude to permit another dictated peace would also be bad. The new totalitarian imperialism springs directly from the example and from the mistakes of the old.

An America which had kept out of war would be far more useful in mediating for decent peace, far more likely to cooperate in disarmament and those economic arrangements upon which such peace depends, than an America which had been involved in war's passions and suffering.

One final word: If I am opposed to American help to the British, which logically means participation in war, I am all the more anxious for American help to the afflicted peoples of Europe. I should like to see not only Americans, but the American government, on a great scale, take responsibility for the relief of war's victims, perhaps to the extent of setting up, at any rate temporarily, a refugee colony in the United States, certainly by a more generous policy of admitting refugees. This sort of service to humanity may keep alive that capacity for compassion and for effective fraternity upon which the future of civilization depends. To that, rather than to participation in war, let us dedicate ourselves.

Youth Crusade

Dedicated to the cause of good government a group of boys and girls have launched an important national movement

FREDERICK R. BECHDOLT

THIS movement began most fittingly on a mountain top. A group of boys were sitting before an open fire in the clubroom of a private school. They were talking of political conditions in our country. Someone put the question: "What can we do to make things better?"

That was five years ago. They did not stop at the question. They went to work. And so it has come about that, in this hard-boiled era, when the words of world statesmen are weighed with universal suspicion and local politicians are viewed with widespread distrust, several thousand school children are challenging you and me with a new slogan: "Make Politics a Noble Profession."

They call themselves the Junior Statesmen of America. During the years since they began banding together, these high school boys and girls have been seeking educations in practical politics and they have been practicing the technique of democratic government. They plan to serve their country.

Politicians have tried to get hold of the organization. Propagandists of various Isms have tried to bore into it. But it has maintained its integrity. No one has made a thin dime from it.

I confess that, when I set forth to investigate the Junior Statesmen, I was a trifle wary. Youth Movements so often mean rackets, either private or political. But before I was through I realized that I was viewing a genuine crusade. And it looks as if the youthful crusaders are going to get somewhere. The plain facts of the story are stimulating; there is in them the nobility of untarnished ideals.

Twenty boys sitting before a fireplace on an autumn evening, talking about saving their country. Boys aren't afraid to try anything, but how did it happen that they were discussing this? And how did it happen that they went to work on their project? And stuck to the task? To see the picture clearly you should understand the background.

E. A. Rogers, president of the Montezuma Mountain School for Boys, is one of those idealists who believe that training for citizenship is a most important part of education. During his thirty odd years as head of the institution in the Santa Cruz mountains of California, he has always stressed that feature. He might not be what some people would call a practical man. His associates tell me that, whenever the school accumulates a surplus of a thousand dollars, he always manages to find some promising youngster who needs a

free scholarship. But he does appear to understand boys. And he has faith in the ideals of youth.

At the beginning of every school year the pupils are initiated in a ceremony which takes place by torchlight in a redwood grove. The newcomers are given their school citizenship, are advised as to its responsibilities. During their school life the boys organize their own government; they handle all discipline with the least possible faculty supervision; the idea of mutual responsibility for the common good is the basis of daily behavior. Members of the graduating class take their leave in the redwood grove at the climax of another simple pageant, whose motive is a good-by to companions going forth to meet larger responsibilities.

A REFRESHING informality marks the contacts of boys and masters. The president of the school is present at weekly gatherings of his pupils in the large clubroom. Here discussions wander over all sorts of subjects; frequently they center on self-government as practiced in this democracy. The easy-going talks and the training toward citizenship have attracted noteworthy visitors. David Starr Jordan used to run up from Stanford quite frequently when he was president of the University.

Perhaps you can see how it came about that, on the evening back in September, 1934, the talk turned—as it had turned many times before—to the problem of American politics. And how these school boys came to ask: "What can we do to make things better?"

In the beginning all ideas were hazy. But the ideas abided. And, a few evenings later several boys came to Rogers' house, asking, "Why can't we organize a junior government? Make it an educational project. Keep it in the high schools. And keep it out of politics. That way, we could train statesmen." Either at that meeting or soon after, someone announced: "A Junior Government. To make politics a noble profession." And another added, "We can save Democracy."

They went straight to work. Boys in their teens came down from that mountain; they spoke in high schools; they must have spoken well and to responsive hearers.

On the ninth of November, 1934, a group of delegates from seven public high schools met at the Montezuma Boys' School, near Los Gatos, California, for "A Conference of Youth on American Ideals."

That is the way they worded it. E. A. Rogers was chosen as president. From the beginning he sat back, letting the boys and girls do the planning, interposing his suggestions only at such times as the gathering seemed threatened by an impasse. During this and successive conferences they adapted the idea of a Junior State and National Government. They chose their slogan, Make Politics a Noble Profession. They planned a campaign for getting America's high schools to offer training in statesmanship to boys and girls as a part of the regular courses of study.

A class forms itself into a governmental unit, municipal or state. Its members function as councilmen or members of a legislature. Such governmental processes as introduction of bills and committee work are carried out in detail. That is the general procedure of the chapters.

The work of promotion went along two lines: enlisting the interest of public-spirited men and women as sponsors, expansion of the organization among the high schools by establishment of classes. The boys and girls who had gathered in the meeting at Rogers' house enlisted in the double task.

During these five years the list of sponsors has grown long. It includes Admiral Richard E. Byrd; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Dr. Paul Cadman of the American Research Foundation; Senator Charles L. McNary of Oregon; Almon E. Roth of San Francisco, past president of Rotary International; Governor Clarence D. Martin of Washington; Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University, and many other notable men and women of all creeds and parties. Most of these names, you will notice, come from the West. There, where the movement was cradled, it still holds its strength.

Expansion has moved slowly. The greatest needs were active sponsors, workers who would procure organization and money. Right at the beginning these offered themselves, various youth movements, equipped and streamlined. Why didn't the Junior Statesmen avail themselves of this help? In those days, when funds were sadly lacking, when E. A. Rogers was drawing on his own bank account to speed the work along, when boys and girls were traveling to address high schools at their own expense, money, professional organizers, advertising and prestige looked very tempting. Less fair prospects have turned much older heads.

THESE youngsters faced the issue in one of the earliest state conventions, while membership was still confined within a few California high schools. A prosperous national organization proffered affiliation. Rogers and two or three other guiding spirits were present. Perhaps they trembled. But, if they did, there was no need. The convention considered the offer and rejected it with thanks. The delegates had looked into it and found that it entailed a partisan alliance.

Some of the offers which came afterward were made in good faith, and, in some, the obligations demanded in return were neatly camouflaged. Invariably these young people discovered the catch.

Now they finance their organization by taxes levied on the members, and donations are accepted on the understanding that there are no strings attached.

Non-Partisan, Non-Sectarian, Non-Secret, Non-Profit. So reads their literature. The boys and girls of twentieth century high schools seem to like these sentiments, for they have received the proselyters with enthusiasm. Teachers were slower to accept. The proposition meant additional classes in already crowded study courses.

GROWTH has gone on steadily. The first convention was held in San Francisco on Washington's Birthday in 1935; it was followed by others in Los Angeles, Oakland, and Hayward, California. Soon classes were functioning; the first Junior Government of California was formed. Then Mr. Rogers and four student speakers addressed a gathering of social science teachers in Oakland and got genuine cooperation. From that time on the organization grew more rapidly.

Several hundred students and teachers from more than twenty-five high schools gathered at the University of California in a Constitutional Convention in April, 1936. Since then, legislative sessions have been held twice a year. Assemblymen and State Senators, elected from high school chapters, gather for one week, introduce bills, do committee work, pass laws. Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Attorney General, and other officials carry on as in an adult commonwealth.

State conventions are held between legislative sessions. Elections to state-wide offices are sometimes hot. For the radio candidates substitute phonograph records of their campaign talks; these are sent to all chapters for hearings. I've listened to more than one Congressman who could learn much about platform speaking from these school children.

Local chapters—high school classes—organize themselves into such governmental units as they choose. In Hayward, California, they have a Junior City Government. Among the ordinances which this body passed last year was one regulating traffic conditions at a crowded street intersection. It looked good enough to the grown-up city fathers for consideration. They adopted it in its entirety.

In Oakland the Junior City Government of Castlemont High School discovered need for a recreational center down in one of the city's poorer districts. And, after they had established it, in theory, by proper ordinance, they brought the matter to the attention of adult city officials, who were sufficiently receptive to make the theory a fact.

In the same city the Junior Statesmen held an open forum. They invited two widely known political leaders to speak: Republican and Democrat. Subjects were the respective party platforms. And, after his talk, each of the speakers was astounded by a far more vigorous and pointed heckling than he had ever met at the hands of grown audiences. Both platforms were subjected to searching questions which showed up discrepancies and weaknesses.

Now the movement has spread into the state of Washington. Fifteen high schools have organized chapters and formed a Junior State Government. And thereby hangs a tale, one of many typical of these boys and girls.

Dick Trudeau's widowed mother is a school teacher, and he has to earn his own spending money. When he became interested in the Junior Statesmen, he conceived the idea of organizing his own state, Washington. He managed to get hold of a second hand car and to buy gas and oil; thereupon, he set forth on his project.

In Seattle, his home town, the School Board had some sort of ruling which made the work of installing chapters much more difficult than it was in California. Which didn't dismay him in the least. He went downtown and got some of the most prominent men in the city, including the Mayor, as sponsors. He drove over to Olympia and enlisted Governor Clarence D. Martin. He persuaded Dr. Paul Lee Seig, president of the University of Washington.

Before the year was out young Trudeau's work had progressed so far that the Junior State of Washington turned over such bills as its legislature had passed to the State Legislature at Olympia for consideration.

TRUDEAU is at work organizing Idaho and Minnesota. At the last session of the Territorial Government, which is a temporary substitute for national government, he was elected president.

It is largely by such efforts on the part of boys and girls and a few public-spirited high school teachers that the idea, born on a California mountain top, has spread. Until now more than eight thousand young people have practiced at statesmanship, in the hope that they may do their bit to Make Politics a Noble Profession.

"This Won't Hurt Much"

Speaking of operations, 1940-style—they are becoming genuinely painless with the recent achievements of science

MARGUERITE CLARK

If you are in for an operation—and three out of five of us have a personal encounter with surgery at some point in our lives—you may be surprised to find how specialized is your case in the matter of anesthetics. Thanks to the scientists who have redoubled their efforts in the last ten years, there is now a particular kind of anesthetic designed for you and the form of operation that you face.

The warfare against pain had been such a long one (dating back to the thirteenth century) that, when ether was finally established as a safe and effective kind of artificial sleep, the medical world relaxed for a time and accepted the blessings of this pain alleviate along with its drawbacks. And while the drawbacks—excessive nausea, inconvenience of the ether mask, and danger of lung irritation resulting in pneumonia—still exist, ether remains the most reliable and convenient anesthetic for emergency operations where hospital facilities are not available, and for use in the smaller hospitals not yet equipped with modern anesthetic devices.

But progressive medical men were never entirely satisfied with ether, and neither were their patients. The doctors knew that in the hands of anesthetists lay the power to make a surgical operation a rest period for the sick person instead of an exhausting and dangerous ordeal. Steadily, experiments with pain-allaying substances were carried on in clinics and laboratories all over the world. Within the past decade, so many new ones have been tested and proved that, given an accurate knowledge of the individual requirements of the patient, the doctor can now name the type of anesthetic best suited to him.

Thus in one of the largest and best equipped hospitals in America last year, only six hundred operations in a list of over six thousand were done under ether. For the others, the newer and more specialized anesthetics were used with amazingly successful results.

In these days, for instance, no highly nervous, overwrought patient is rushed off on a stretcher in a conscious state, strapped to the operating table, and subjected to the horror of a feeling of impending suffocation caused by involuntary blindfolding of the ether mask, coupled with fear. Instead, before he has had time to feel sorry for himself, he is given avertin in what he thinks is an ordinary enema. Dropping immediately into a smooth, deep sleep, he arrives in the operating room nicely relaxed and unconscious. What goes on thereafter, in the way of a few whiffs of gas to keep the patient in the deep plane of surgical anesthesia, is the business of the anesthetist.

When the patient recovers consciousness, he is back in his bed, the operation is over, and he hasn't experienced one moment of alarm over pre-operation routine. Nor are there any after-effects, aside from some natural soreness. No nausea, no painful coughing, no danger of ether pneumonia, no memory horror.

In fact, the patient is usually embarrassed when well-meaning friends console him with: "Poor man, I know just what you've been through!" Because the man himself doesn't know. "It is like releasing a spring that is wound too tight," he marvels. The doctor will help him out by explaining that one of the most agreeable things about avertin is its power to bring relaxation to tense muscles.

Avertin, known in clinical circles as "Tri-brom-ethyl-alcohol," was discovered in 1923 by a couple of German chemists who were experimenting with narcotics through yeast, fermentation of bromal. Later, when it went into general use as a basal anesthetic, it was named "avertin" because of its ability to avert the psychic terror of surgery and anesthetics, caused by actual experience with less sparing mediums, or by gruesome stories recounted by friends.

"What you don't know," say the grateful users of avertin, "will not hurt you."

All very pleasing to incurious folk, but a sad disappointment to those of us who want to know everything about our operations, who read medical books and study X-rays and ask questions. (Fortunately the surgeons do not get many of these.)

For such people, spinal anesthesia, another specialized form, offers a regular field day. If they look sharp and listen well, they may be able to see and hear the details of their operations as they occur. For spinal anesthesia puts you to sleep below the ribs and leaves your mind awake. A needle

is put in the small of your back, a solution of procaine, say, is injected, and after that you do not feel anything at all south of the belt line.

This kind of anesthesia is widely used for people who have weak lungs or bronchial tubes, since it leaves the throat and lungs unaffected, and for any surgery below the diaphragm. It is a favorite for intestinal obstructions of all kinds, and for emergency operations which do not allow time for complete preparation of the patient.

Then there are the simple intravenous sleep-producers whereby some such substance as evipal or pentothal is injected into your veins, sending you deeply and pleasantly to sleep and keeping you there for a short time. Long enough for the opening of a painful boil, say, or the dressing of a mastoid case.

A needle and syringe, a jab in the inside of your elbow, and you hear the doctor say: "Let me know when you feel drowsy." The chances are good that you will not say when. You'll fall into an agreeable slumber from which you'll emerge thirty minutes later with the surgical work done and no foggy hangover.

For years now a highly important anesthetic problem has been that of relief in childbirth. Spinal anesthesia, the injection of novocaine or procaine in the canal of the spinal cord, is not entirely satisfactory; such an injection may possibly cause damage to the brain and spinal cord, and interfere with heart action. Nitrous oxide and ether are doubtful mediums, too, since they tend to rob the blood stream of mother and child of oxygen.

In progressive hospitals, new experiments for relief in labor are being carried out. Many anesthetists are now trying the plan of filling the empty epidural space at the base of the spine, between the sheath of the spinal cord and the inner wall of the spinal column, with a distilled water solution of one of the local anesthetics, such as intracaine, or pantocaine. By bathing the nerve trunks of the child-birth organs, this solution effectively dulls pain without decreasing the efficiency of the motor nerves which help to force the child out of the birth canal.

There's a different action length in each of these local anesthetics: intracaine, pantocaine, metycaine; and the obstetrician, on gauging the length of labor, can choose the drug that will have the right length and effect.

The famous Gwathmey method of painless delivery in childbirth is nothing more than artificial sleep produced by an enema of olive oil, ether and quinine, and a mild hypnotic given by mouth. Ether administered in this manner produces no disagreeable odor, no sharp taste, and very little nausea. Entire unconsciousness is not had, just enough to relieve pain and relax the tissues. The patient remains sufficiently conscious to help in labor, but she has no memory of the event.

To most of us, anesthesia means putting a patient to sleep for an operation, but scientists have also to keep in mind the inoperable cases where pain must be allayed, as well as the chronic troubles, such as the painful rheumatism known as sciatica, and the late stages of angina pectoris. For the pains in the chest following that most distressing of heart ailments, there is a new development—that of blocking off the pain nerves by chemical solution. Regional anesthesia, some of the doctors call it. A solution of procaine and alcohol is injected in the sympathetic nerve, and, in favorable cases, relief from pain follows as soon as the nerve is blocked.

While the temporary surcease from pain does not mean that the angina pectoris sufferer will not again have similar attacks, his general health is greatly improved by being relieved of the exhaustion associated with the pain. The block nerve study is the outgrowth of research in the special department of anesthetics in Bellevue Hospital.

For face and throat operations, the doctors at Johns Hopkins are also using a block anesthesia which checks the nerves so that they cannot carry a pain message to the brain.

SAID one patient while undergoing an operation for the removal of a nasal obstruction: "Listen to the hammering. It's like a woodpecker at work on a dead tree. And it doesn't hurt a bit." There would have been pain, all right, if block anesthesia hadn't made of the man's nasal area an alien territory for a short time, with no brain communication.

Block anesthesia is also being used by dentists to make our trips to their offices less tortuous. The teeth men also are experimenting with relief from drilling pain, and apparently are close to their goal.

A new machine called "Analgesia" uses nitrous oxide (laughing gas) combined with oxygen. Just before the dentist begins work, the patient squeezes a bulb and feeds himself the precious drops through a nasal inhaler, taking just enough to bring himself below the level of pain. At the first new twinge, he again presses the bulb, and the grinding goes on without pain. While "Analgesia" isn't strong enough to allow for painless extraction, it does permit drilling to be done in comfort.

The study of anesthetics goes on—the search for the ideal pain-killing agent. It seemed to have been achieved when two men in Toronto, Henderson and Lucas, discovered the anesthetic properties of cyclopropane. This colorless hydro-carbon gas, with its rather pleasant naphtha-like odor, is nontoxic, easy to take, affords quiet breathing and no depression in circulation. It relaxes the patient completely and brings him to a rapid recovery when the operation is over.

Medical men were delighted with cyclopropane. Said one: "My conception of anesthesia with the older gases is that we administer the gas plus enough oxygen to keep the patient alive and in good condition. With cyclopropane, on the other hand, we administer oxygen with just enough of the gas to keep the patient asleep."

But cyclopropane, along with the other anesthetic gases, is inflammable, and capable of being exploded when mixed with certain proportions of air or oxygen. And there the danger lies.

This hazard is being avoided to a large extent by the fact that there is little contamination of the operating room atmosphere when the proper completely closed carbon dioxide absorption technique is used in the administering of cyclopropane. Even so, the doctors and attendants are very careful with the use of cautery, electric knives, diathermy and other electrical gadgets in the room where there are anesthetic gases in use.

The danger of explosions in operating rooms resulting from the union of static electricity in the atmosphere and anesthetic mixtures has been done away with largely as a result of a new device which determines the exact amount of electricity present. When this contrivance shows that a dangerous amount of static electricity is in the air, more humidity, to counteract the electricity, is pumped in to the operating room by ventilation and water vapor.

While the freezing treatment for cancer, popularly called "Frozen Sleep," remains in the experimental stage so far as its curative value is concerned, it needs no further proof of its worth as an orthodox pain-killer.

The process of packing the anesthetized patient in ice, and then reducing the normal temperature of the body about ten degrees for a period of thirty-six hours or so, provides comparative comfort in inoperable cancer cases and those which fail to respond to narcotics. And relief from pain is the chief result claimed so far from the cold-storage treatment.

Helium is mentioned as the latest anesthetic agent, and now that its use has been perfected, doctors at the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University say most of the obstacles previously encountered in the administration of anesthetics will be less difficult to overcome. Since helium is inert, its value depends on its low specific gravity and property of rapid diffusion. When added to any gaseous mixture, helium acts as a thinner, which enables the anesthetic to be moved with less effort, and also to pass through small spaces at a greater flow.

HELIUM can be taken into the lungs of a patient and expelled much more easily than other gases because of its lightness. Because of its expense, it is rarely employed, except during the use of carbon dioxide absorption technique, or during the course of an anesthetic when a respiratory obstruction develops. Eventually, at a lower cost, its use will be greater. Within the last eighteen months, the government has been induced to make helium available to anesthetists for this purpose. It is now supplied by manufacturers in cylinders which may be attached to ordinary gas machines.

Painless surgery? If you have undergone an operation under old-fashioned conditions, you may be skeptical of the doctor's cheerful assurance: "This won't hurt much!"

But if you are lucky enough to have your surgical work done with benefit of modern science, there may be something more in this than a hearty bedside manner. In all probability, you will come back to consciousness bent on finding out how the other fellow looks. For those in charge will see that you are spared the details of the fray.

Housing Does Its Part

The United States Housing Administrator points out how national defense and housing will work together

NATHAN STRAUS

WITH insistent regularity nowadays, the question is asked whether the low-rent housing and slum clearance program can be continued and expanded in view of the rising demand for armaments and other implements of national defense. Most of the discussions on this subject divide naturally into three main approaches.

The first approach is to argue that all public spending for programs of social advancement should be stopped temporarily or reduced to a minimum, in order to devote every dollar available to the production of war planes and land batteries. I yield to no one in my firm conviction that America must at once make itself safe against any combination of powers that conceivably might threaten our shores or those of our neighbors. But I refuse to believe that America is so poor that it cannot defend its people from foreign foes and from domestic evils as well. It is unthinkable to me that America would be so short-sighted as to build defenses while ignoring the ideals and the aspirations which make our progressive democracy so worth defending.

The second approach to the reconciliation of public housing with national defense veers to the opposite extreme. It insists that all of our human betterment programs should be carried on faster and more extensively today than ever before. It asserts that the social contentment and faith in democracy which such programs instill will serve to protect us better than all the armaments we might forge. While I must confess that this argument strikes a sympathetic note, the sober realities of today will not permit its unqualified acceptance. We know that many lands which advanced their social frontiers and expanded their public housing programs but neglected adequate defense have found themselves stripped and unprepared, when ruthlessly attacked by other nations where social reforms had gone into a decline and where military might had become the sole concern of the State.

The third approach to the problem of housing in these times seems to me to steer a wise course between the extreme of alarmist pessimism and the extreme of blind-folded overexuberance. It recognizes the potential threat to our safety implicit in world-wide conditions, it insists that we must meet this threat and make ourselves safe beyond all question, but nonetheless it accords our various programs for social advancement their appropriate and continuing place in our national economy. More than that, it seeks to rationalize and harmonize these primary social objectives with the development of an adequate national defense program.

In many ways, the public housing program is one of the easiest to harmonize with a program of national defense. It is easy to see that, in the unexpected event of bombardment, durable, well-spaced public housing projects afford more protection and security than the crowded firetrap of the slums. It is obvious that sturdier standard-bearers of democracy will emerge from decent and wholesome homes than from the germ-infested areas of the slums. It is impossible to overlook the indispensable moral quality added to the lives of a people who have known decent standards of living.

But these easy generalities are not enough. I meet people who smilingly admit their validity, but who invariably counter with the remark: "What you say is very true, but the housing program costs far too much to allow it to burden the Federal budget in these particular times."

The fact is that the public housing program does not cost the Government much at all. Public housing projects are not constructed with Federal subsidies or grants. They are built entirely with funds loaned by investors who purchase housing authority bonds, and who receive over the period of their investment the full return of their principal plus a fair and regular rate of interest. After the projects are built and occupied, the Federal Government (along with the localities) does pay annual subsidies to help families from the slums meet that portion of the annual charges for decent housing, which we call rent, that they cannot afford to meet from their meager incomes. This Federal subsidy represents a net cost to the Treasury, at present interest rates, of only about $75 a year per family helped, or less than $20

a year per person helped. The whole amount included in the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1941 for the payment of these subsidies is only $10,000,000, and the actual net cost to the Government will be considerably less than this because of the interest-spread in favor of the USHA on the money which it lends.

This means that, when a family of low income is helped to live in decent housing instead of a slum for a full generation, the whole cost to the Treasury is less than the cost of one broadside fired from the guns of one of our largest battleships in target practice. It means that to build one capital ship costs more than five times as much as the whole USHA program costs the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year. More significantly, the public housing program could be expanded to the point where our whole national slum problem would be solved, at an annual cost to the Federal Government of less than one-tenth the present annual appropriations for the Army and Navy alone. In short, America can afford a much bigger Navy and at the same time more public housing too.

But if it is only a generality to say that better homes make a nation stronger in health and morale, and if it is only a negative argument to say that housing does not cost enough to interfere with national defense, there remain the compelling positive arguments linking inseparably the need for housing with the need for defense.

During the last World War, even before we entered it (and I earnestly hope and trust we shall never need to enter this one), the expansion of our industries in unexpected places and at an unexpected rate to produce materials related to military needs led to acute housing conditions. For example, a meeting in August 1917 in Bridgeport, Connecticut, was described as follows:

"It was stated that during the past two years the Bridgeport payroll had increased at the rate of $500,000 per week. High rents were stated to be absorbing fully a quarter of this. Owing to the decline of home building after the outbreak of the European War, the city had become dangerously overcrowded. Practically all the Bridgeport industries were engaged in war work. Existing plants had been extended, unused plants had been rehabilitated and new plants had been built. . . . With no new housing available and with existing quarters crowded far beyond the point of comfort or safety there could be but one result. The plants working on cost-plus contracts were bound to draw labor away from those working on fixed price contracts and thus contribute to disastrous delays in the delivery of war materials."

Very quickly the housing emergency during the last war translated itself into a labor emergency. A report from the Alabama nitrate towns in 1918 said:

"The housing facilities at present existing are entirely inadequate to provide for this large influx and, while a large number engaged in construction work are housed in cantonments at the side of the works, many are living in town under congested conditions, which, in addition to the potential dangers from overcrowding, are causing discontent and dissatisfaction. This is clearly reflected in the large labor turnover, estimated at 400 per cent, which obtains in spite of high wages."

In the same year, 1918, this plea came from Portsmouth, New Hampshire:

"It is impossible to obtain living quarters anywhere within reasonable distance of the Navy Yard . . . . a large number of the best mechanics, accustomed to a fair standard of living, are unwilling to put up with these conditions although in many cases they have come here from long distances at great expense. They work only a few days and then leave, while their experiences influence others to stay away."

Such were the conditions somewhat more than two decades ago. If during the next few years there takes place an expansion of defense industries at all comparable to that which took place during the first World War period, the housing shortage will undoubtedly be far more dangerous than it was then. The decade preceding the first World War was a period of a relatively high rate of residential construction. From 1905 to 1914 there was not one year in which fewer than 400,000 new homes were erected. Today, there is no such store-house of home construction upon which to draw. The early 1930's were marked by a swift, in fact catastrophic, decline in residential construction. The later 1930's brought but a slow recovery. The average for the entire decade has been about 230,000 new homes a year, or a little more than half the average number produced during the ten years ending in 1914.

As a result, practically all of our cities and towns are already faced with a housing shortage. Today, according to vacancy surveys published by the Department of Commerce, vacancy ratios of less than 3 per cent, and in some cases as low as 1 per cent, exist in cities like Buffalo, Camden, Akron, Detroit, Baltimore, Dallas, Seattle, and San Diego—cities of key importance in the development of our national defense program. The United States today has an actual housing shortage variously estimated as from seven million to ten million sanitary healthful homes.

The "Harbor Area" of Los Angeles County is illustrative of the housing plight of many large industrial communities. Over the past decade,

more than 1,000 new industrial plants have been established in the county, while about 1,500 industrial establishments have been expanded. As a result, it is estimated that there are already about 90,000 families in the "Harbor Area," with thousands of low income workers and their families crowded into insanitary and dilapidated neighborhoods.

A recent survey conducted in the "Harbor Area" by the United States Navy Department revealed that the rents which families around the San Pedro Naval base have to pay are far out of proportion to their incomes. Families with an average income of about $75 a month have been paying fully one-third of their incomes for a place to live, while families whose incomes average about $50 a month have been paying nearly half of their scant earnings for shelter alone.

The facts build up an irrefutable case that in innumerable areas of the country we shall shortly face a housing problem so pressing that the emergency faced during the last World War period will be dwarfed by comparison. Labor turnovers will be high, production will be slowed down, costs will mount skyward and dissatisfaction will run rife—unless we take energetic steps now to meet the need.

To a limited extent, unaided private industry will swing into the service of this need. But everything in past experience has proved that it can meet only a small part of the need in such times, and nothing in present conditions indicates that the future will be different from the past.

Private industry cannot meet the needs of that large proportion of the workers in areas of industrial expansion whose incomes are too low to prompt private industry to build an adequate supply of decent housing for their use. By the same token, private industry alone has not and cannot meet the needs of the families of enlisted men of low income, excluding officers, drawn to new naval or military reservations. Already, thousands of these families are either separated because of housing conditions or living in slums.

The sudden development of new areas of industrial expansion, and their uncertain long-term future, are additional reasons why unaided private industry shuns the risk of building houses to meet the need. The unanswerable reply to those who say that public housing should also shun this risk is that people must live as well as work, and the fact that their work may be temporary does not reduce the urgency of their need for decent shelter. Moreover, a well-planned public housing program will tend to make the new housing such as to serve community needs. A well-planned public housing program will avoid the pitfalls of reckless and slipshod jerry building, and will integrate mushroom growth with long-term city planning based on an assessment of long and short-term needs.

There is little reason to fear, in the average case, that such well-planned and well-integrated housing projects will be left vacant after the emergency is over. They will be built in the first instance to house a sudden influx of workers, which will necessitate a suspension of the general rule that one slum dwelling must be eliminated for every new dwelling built. But if the passing of the emergency brings an exodus of workers, the new houses will then be available as low-rent homes into which families from shacks and slums may move.

In addition to the need for housing industrial workers in new areas, there is the need for housing the families of enlisted men. This is basically a civilian need, and is so recognized by the War and Navy Departments. It calls for the same solution as housing for industrial workers.

To meet the insistent needs of both industrial workers and the families of enlisted men, the Navy and War Departments in collaboration with the USHA have prepared a simple amendment to the United States Housing Act. This amendment provides for the construction of accommodations for the families of enlisted men, excluding officers. This construction would be undertaken directly by the War or Navy Department, with loans from the USHA, or in some cases it would be undertaken by the USHA itself in the discretion of the President. No subsidy would be involved, as the maintenance and the operation of the projects would be undertaken by the War or Navy Department. Management, and the ownership of the projects after the repayment of the USHA loan, would rest with the War or Navy Department.

In addition, the amendment authorizes the USHA to expedite the construction of housing for workers in new industrial areas, generally through the established machinery of local housing authorities, but in special circumstances where necessary by direct Federal construction or through the utilization of existing state or local machinery. The addition of this amendment to the Housing Act, along with funds to carry it forward, would make us prepared where we were unprepared before to coordinate housing with national defense.

In conclusion, while we should keep the needs of the defense program ever before us, we should by no means limit the public housing program. So long as one-third of our people live in slums, no emergency now before us, and none which we have any reason to expect, should distract our attention from the overwhelming central housing problem. This problem is to place more of the "one-third of a nation" who live in slums in the kind of homes to which the technical and financial resources of America entitle them. Good homes are the first line of defense of a democracy.

Hawaii States Her Case

After years of effort territorial residents hope that their dreams of achieving statehood will come true

LAWRENCE M. JUDD
Former Governor of Hawaii

A HUNDRED thousand American citizens are barred from voting in the national election November 5 because they are residents of the Territory of Hawaii.

This anomaly in our political life is but one facet of a picture involving thousands of patriotic Americans who are enthusiastically carrying all the burdens and duties of citizenship, while being penalized by the same government to whose support they are annually contributing more in taxes than fourteen individual states.

"It is obvious that such a community as Hawaii, industrious, prosperous and progressive, will not be content for long to be held in a subordinate position in comparison with other parts of the nation," reported a joint committee of the Senate and House after visiting the territory in 1937. "It is hardly conceivable," the report continued, "that the United States, dedicated to the very principle of self-government and equal treatment of its citizens, should long desire to impose any restrictions upon the full measure of self-government to be accorded Hawaii."

The people of Hawaii, as the Congressional Committee states, are no longer content to be "held in a subordinate position." They are asking statehood forthwith. The next step in the forty-two year old campaign for statehood will come November 5 when citizens go to the polls in a special plebiscite to answer this question posed to them by Congress: "Do You Favor Statehood for Hawaii?" One would naturally think that forty-two years of requesting such a status would be conclusive enough of the feelings of the populace, but so far Congress has failed to be convinced.

Hawaii recognizes and appreciates that taking a forty-ninth state into the Union is of tremendous importance, and is willing to meet every request made by Congress. Hence, the plebiscite to determine whether or not the people want something they have been asking for for more than two score years.

Hawaii's efforts to become a state are not news —going back even further than the forty-two years mentioned. Franklin Pierce was being inaugurated our fourteenth president, Chicago and New York were being linked by rail for the first time, and Congress was completing the Gadsen Purchase, when Hawaii's initial statehood move was launched. That was in 1853 while the Islands were still a monarchy. Negotiations with the state department at that time proceeded so far that a treaty was drafted providing for annexation of Hawaii as a state. Sudden death of King Kamehameha III brought a halt to this move, because his successor permitted negotiations to lapse.

The independent monarchy continued until 1893 when it was overthrown. The new government immediately sent commissioners to Washington to negotiate for entrance of Hawaii into the Union as a state. It was not until 1898, after a Republic of Hawaii had been formed, that Hawaii came into the Union as a territory, not as a state. Citizens of the Republic, nevertheless, ceded their sovereignty and all public properties to the government of the United States in the belief that territorial status, as they had been assured, was one of the formal steps leading to statehood.

The people of Hawaii are still waiting for the other "formal" steps to be taken. Session after session the territorial legislature has requested Congress to pass an act enabling Hawaii to become a state. Beginning in 1903, such petitions were addressed to Congress in 1911, 1913, 1915, 1917, 1919, 1927, 1931, 1933, 1937, and 1939. The Legislature and the general public have underwritten the expenses of ten successive Congressional committees to visit the Islands and study the Territory's qualifications for statehood.

The most recent of these committees (1937) asked that a plebiscite be held to determine specifically the sentiment for statehood. This plebiscite is termed by the people of Hawaii "the most important question ever to come before the Territory."

"There is no logical, honorable or legal basis for discrimination of any type against the Territory of Hawaii in favor of any other part of the United States," declares Samuel Wilder King, Hawaii's lone voteless delegate to Congress. "Its citizens are citizens of the United States. They bear all the burdens and are entitled to all the benefits. The Territory is an inseparable part of the United

States; it became a part of the United States as a result of its voluntary act as a sovereign state; it transferred its property to the United States and surrendered its sovereignty under the provisions of an agreement that it was to become an integral part of our nation. As citizens of our country, we ask and expect, in simple justice, that we be accorded equal treatment with the rest of our country."

To speak of discrimination among American citizens may be surprising to those who do not live in Hawaii. Yet the instances of such unequal treatment are many and varied. That Hawaii's charges of unfair treatment are facts, not theory, is attested by the following example.

Writing to Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in 1937, Charles West, acting secretary of the Department of the Interior, said:

"I desire to call to your attention some of the grave discriminations against the Territory of Hawaii which occurred in Senate Bill No. 1757. The Department of the Interior wishes to reemphasize that the people of Hawaii are citizens of the United States in the fullest sense of the word and any discriminatory treatment of them in legislation is unjust and unjustifiable. . . . There are a half dozen or more passages in this bill which are discriminatory and unfair to Hawaii. . ."

On this same measure, Delegate King told the Senate finance committee that, "while the pending measure relates to one island industry, the issue is far broader than its effect on any one industry. It affects every man, woman and child in the Territory; it affects every industry; it affects all our commerce.

"The proposed unfair treatment of Hawaii is based on an amazing principle—that if a territory of the United States is separate from the continent by salt water, the discrimination against it is justified. When Oklahoma was Indian Territory, no one would have thought of legislating against it in a discriminatory manner. Surely it cannot be true that the mere fact that Hawaii is an island territory warrants any such differentiation.

"Hawaii does not want better treatment or different treatment—it wants only equal treatment."

This is but one example of the watchfulness Hawaii must maintain to insure just treatment in national legislation.

The people of Hawaii, having faced this danger for more than forty years, believe the time has come to secure equality with the rest of the nation. Neither the future of the Territory, as an American community, nor the future of any individual, they say, can be safe, so long as conditions exist which permit national discriminatory legislation which could wreck the financial and social well-being of the Islands.

Hawaii points to other rights, too, which it would gain from statehood.

Taxation without representation would be eliminated. The Organic Act framed by Congress, and under which the Territory is governed would be replaced by a state constitution. At the moment the Organic Act can be amended or repealed by Congress without consulting the people of the Territory; the state constitution could not. Two senators and one representative would be sent from Hawaii to Congress instead of the present voteless delegate. Citizens would be able to participate in national elections, as well as elect their chief administrative executives who are now appointed by the President. No longer could Hawaii be ignored in the allocation of federal monies.

Statehood would also be a guarantee against future curtailment of present rights, which may be revoked at the whim of Congress—even, possibly, to the substitution of military and naval commission rule for the present civilian government.

People of Hawaii feel they are fully justified in asking for statehood on the basis of their record. In support of this they readily enumerate the unofficial requirements for advancing a territory to statehood and show they more than meet the qualifications.

An accepted test of a territory's economic stability is the gross assessed value of its real and personal property. In this respect, Hawaii with its total at $425,203,000 is well above ten or more of the states. Hawaii's purchases of commodities from mainland United States in 1929 totaled $101,817,230. As a market for continental United States products, Hawaii was exceeded in its purchases by only four foreign nations—United Kingdom, Canada, Japan and France.

Hawaii has been on territorial probation for forty-two years, longer than nine of the last twelve states admitted into the Union; Hawaii's superb system of public education has created a body of exceptionally intelligent and loyal American voters; four of the present states have a smaller population than Hawaii. Soundness of its public finances is unquestioned. No territorial or county bond issue has ever been defaulted.

Hawaii's fitness for statehood on the basis of its tax paying ability is clearly demonstrated by the fact that its tax contributions to the federal treasury are in excess of those of many states. Its 1939 payment to the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue was $11,893,768.67. This exceeded the payments made by North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nevada, Idaho, Vermont, Arizona, Montana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Arkansas, Utah, South Carolina. Hawaii has paid the federal treasury some $150,000,000 more than it has received in return.

The justice of Hawaii's claims are usually readily admitted, but some people on the mainland tend to discount the Territory's excellent record and qualifications for statehood by entering as an objection the possibility that Hawaiian elections would be controlled by a single racial group. This assertion is best answered by the official report of the joint Congressional Committee which wrote:

"The entire discussion of Japanese in Hawaii has too frequently been marked by prejudice and by erroneous statements given as facts . . . . On the basis of behaviour, the American citizens of Japanese ancestry leave little to criticize and much to praise. As an orderly, law-abiding group their record is unexcelled. The evidence of schools and civic organizations, of church and political activities, all point to a desire on their part to share to the full the community responsibilities and to do so as fellow Americans, expressing a common loyalty to American ideals and institutions.

"The Americanization of the Japanese in Hawaii has perhaps made more progress than it has with many immigrant groups of longer residence in mainland America. Time will automatically solve many of the problems that seem to loom up as insurmountable today. Election results fail to indicate any serious bloc voting by the Japanese or any other racial unit. Since no single group dominates the electorate of Hawaii, it is certain that the voting along racial lines by any one group would bring immediate reprisals by the others."

Further testimony is given by Major General Charles A. Herron, commanding the Hawaiian Department of the U.S. Army.

"It seems the people who know the least about Hawaii, and who live the greatest distance from it, are the most disturbed over this matter of the Japanese," he says. "People who have the most to lose personally, and who know the Islands and the Island people best, are not worried. After my years of service here, I am sold on the Americanization and the patriotism of the people of Hawaii as a whole."

The average citizen of Hawaii sums up his reasons for voting affirmatively in the November 5 plebiscite somewhat along these lines:

"We believe after forty-two years of guardianship the territory should be put on a plane of equality with the states. We bear our share of the federal taxes, and more. We are Americans in every sense of the word. Our standard of living is American. Our thoughts are American. Our very life is American. We are no different from Americans in New York, California, Wisconsin or Louisiana. Since we are the equal of the states in so many points of fact, why should we be inferior in point of law?"

The Banks Go Democratic

The banker has shelved his glossy silk hat and put on a plebeian brown derby to attract business

HOWARD MAIER

A BANK used to be a Greco-Roman building sheathed in icy austerity; today it is a service station, eager to meet the humblest financial needs of the community. Needless to say, this change was not wrought by sheer altruism. It took $6,000,000,000 lying idle to make the bankers feel the necessity of reaching out for the business of the hitherto unnoticed little fellow. As one New York banker frankly admits: "We needed additional revenue. To get it, we took off our silk hat and put on a brown derby."

First among the "brown derby" innovations in banking was a check-writing system planned to fit the needs of small businessmen, housewives, laborers, and white-collar workers. Here were a million potential customers who could not possibly maintain the minimum balance ranging from $50 to $1000 formerly necessary for a checking account.

"All right," said some banks. "We'll eliminate the minimum balance. Just pay for your checks as you write them." And, to their surprise, America wrote them! Big checks, little checks, checks to the tune of $2,000,000,000 a year. A brand new profit of millions a year for the banks, made from nickels and dimes in the best Woolworth tradition.

This revolutionary "nickel-a-check" idea was the brain-child of Alexander Efron, vice-president of

New York's National Safety and Trust Bank. His "CheckMaster plan," and the whole theory of no-minimum-balance banking, is simplicity itself. A single dollar is sufficient to open an account. The customer receives a checkbook free, and the bank then charges him five cents for each check he writes and five cents for each item he deposits. And that's all there is to it.

But, as befits guardians of the public's money, the bankers were difficult to convince. The Federal Reserve was dubious. Old-line bankers found distasteful the thought of turning their hallowed institutions into huge public utilities, so that anyone could buy service from a bank for five cents, just as anyone can buy service from a subway by simply dropping a nickel in the turnstile.

Efron's own bank was none too enthusiastic. But, fighting a long uphill battle, he finally won the right to experiment. The plan was a huge and immediate success; extra squads of clerks were needed to handle crowds. Right from the start, "CheckMaster" made money for the National Safety. Whereupon various highly dignified banks climbed hurriedly aboard the bandwagon.

Today the Chase National, the Manufacturer's Trust, the National City in New York and hundreds of others from Maine to California have "special checking accounts" embodying the principle of "no-minimum-balance." All are more or less variations on the "CheckMaster" theme. All are thriving and successful.

Then Edgar W. Penton of Detroit suggested a brand new idea to the banks. He called it the "Cash Order Plan," and based it on the thrifty desire to save money by purchasing for cash.

According to a survey conducted by the Ross Federal Research Bureau, more than half the wage earners in the United States spend all of their pay-checks by the day following pay-day; only 27 percent have one-tenth of their wages left the next day. Do people throw this money away? No, says Penton, they have honestly paid the grocer, the baker, the butcher and numerous others who have extended them credit until pay-day. And they have also paid, without knowing it, an added credit carrying-charge of from 12 to 20 percent. Now if the banks advanced the credit and charged only a nominal fee, customers could buy for cash and save money. This is the "Cash Order Plan" objective.

Here's how it works: John Smith, who earns $50 weekly, goes to a bank and establishes the fact that he has a steady job and good reputation. The bank gives him a line of credit (generally 60 percent of the salary check, or in Mr. Smith's hypothetical case, $30). The bank issues to Smith six official cashier checks for $5.00 each. There are no co-signers or collateral required. Mr. Smith deposits no money in the bank and pays nothing for the issuance of the checks. If, between pay-days, he uses none of the checks, it costs him exactly nothing. But if Mr. Smith uses any of them, he must, within 24 hours after his next pay-day, pay for them, plus a service charge of 15 cents on each. There are no other charges.

"Fantastic!" cried the reactionaries. "It will bring only the necessitous borrower into the banks —the man who just wants quick money. Our branches will be clogged with deadbeats."

Despite rumbles of disapproval, in September of 1939 the progressive Morris Plan Bank of Schenectady, N. Y., offered Penton's Cash Order Plan. Immediately the public rushed to accept. In the first few months well over 600 accounts were opened, and each week brings another twenty or more.

Then in October, the Empire Trust Company of New York inaugurated a similar service called "Certified Credit Checks." To date, and without the aid of large-scale advertising, the Empire has opened more than 5000 of these new accounts.

Once again the reactionaries were proved wrong. "Cash Order" appeals to substantial folk. Although less than 10 percent of users have checking accounts, well over 50 percent have savings accounts; over 80 percent carry life insurance, and all give adequate store references. After eight months of operation, the Schenectady bank finds that less than one percent of its accounts are delinquent over twenty-four hours.

A third "brown derby" bank service covers insurance. Originating in "Bancredit," a subsidiary of the First National Bank of St. Paul, it is now being presented to the public by other large banks as the "Stevens Plan." Although its mathematics seem very complex, the backbone of the plan is simple.

In nearly all cases an insurance company will sell a three-year fire, burglar or liability policy at two-and-a-half times the yearly rate. If the annual premium is $100, the three-year rate will be $250 instead of $300. But a great many people do not have $250. They renew year after year at $100.

Under the new plans, the bank steps in and pays the three-year premium, and allows the customer to repay in monthly, quarterly or yearly instalments. The charge for this service is generally six percent. On a three-year policy, where the premium is $100 per year, the insured will save $36.50 after paying the bank's charge; on a five-year policy, $56.80.

For years banks had grudgingly accepted assignments of life insurance policies as collateral. Now they began to think seriously about them. There were 46,000,000 life insurance policies in force in the United States. Due to life's ups and downs, a vast number of policyholders borrowed against

them. For the loans the insurance companies charged either five-and-a-half or six percent.

What's wrong, thought the banks, with going after this business hammer and tongs? Money is cheap. And life insurance is the safest loan collateral in the world. A group of New York banks formed the spearhead of the attack. Many banks now will take an assignment of a life insurance policy (unless minors are beneficiaries) and loan up to 95 percent of its cash surrender value, charging from three to four percent. Which means that a man borrowing $10,000 against his life insurance policy may pay only $300 a year in place of the $600 charged by his own insurance company.

Quite naturally, the insurance companies did not welcome this innovation, but there was nothing they could do about it. State insurance laws force them to charge the five-and-a-half percent or six percent stipulated in the policies. So the banks moved merrily in, and are now fattening on the clover in insurance's own backyard.

The banks have made their offices pleasanter places in which to do business. Some build "drive-in" ramps so that the customer can make deposits and withdrawals without leaving his car. A Syracuse bank has bought a nearby garage to provide free parking facilities for its customers. Some even sell stamps as an added convenience.

One Philadelphia bank set up a job-finding service for unemployed customers. A Brooklyn bank gives movie shows for churches to help pay the amortization on "church loans." The business department of the bank handles the entire show (generally travel films) and the return to the church is as high as $50 to $200 in a single night.

A good many banks now offer customers a "Bill Paying Terminal." The customer leaves all his monthly bills and the money to pay them with the teller, and the bank does the rest. A Utica, N. Y., bank gives free demonstrations on cooking to all who can crowd into its beautiful kitchen; a Canadian bank has made itself the channel for the placing of classified ads; a middle western institution keeps open all summer on Saturday nights between eight and nine p.m. for the benefit of its farmer depositors.

During 1939 the banks averaged 3,000 loans every banking hour. These loans are many and varied; in the South, banks have been lending money to hospitals for air-conditioning. In Tennessee, banks now loan money to pay delinquent property taxes. In many cases this has saved homes from a forced sale. Through a system of "Tax Certificates" the bank helps the owner to work out a feasible plan of easy payments.

It is estimated the farmer uses $750 worth of short term credit a year on the average. The banks want this potential $130,000,000 annual business and are going after it in democratic style. Boston banks lend money on unpicked blueberries and cranberries to finance the harvesting. Five years ago, they wouldn't.

Alabama banks stand ready to loan any 4-H Club boy or girl the money to buy a calf, a pig, one hundred baby chicks, or three sheep. One bank lent fifty bulls to fifty scattered farmers on the sound principle that better live stock contributed to the wealth of the community. The bank estimates that produced 3,000 calves are worth considerably more than if bred from the poor native sires.

Where the banks have been most successful is in the handling of small personal loans. Slowly but surely they have invaded this lucrative field. By radio, newspaper, billboard and magazine, they have begged and cajoled the small businessman and wage earner to come to them when they need loans. No loan was too small for banks. They were out to hurt the shyster and loan shark. If the public needed financing, they'd finance it and keep the charges well outside the realm of usury.

So successful have they been that today there are over 10,000 banks throughout the United States more than willing to finance a young couple's honeymoon expenses, furnish their new home, buy them an automobile and pay the freight on the stork's first visit. Democratic? Why, it's almost paternal.

War Imperils America!

A plea that the U.S. act with courage to forestall the threat of a triumphant Germany

DOUGLAS JOHNSON
Author, scientist, Professor at Columbia University

AMERICA'S future will be settled on the battlefields of Europe, whether or not we will it so, and whether or not we participate in the settlement. The American people are just awakening to this unpalatable fact.

Lulled to sleep by the bedtime stories of shortsighted isolationists and emotional pacifists, we have dreamed away the years in comfortable assurance that events in Europe, no matter how tragic, can not affect America's future so long as we shut our eyes to them. The seizure of Austria, the rape of Czechoslovakia, the slaughter of Poland, the brutal assault on Finland, the "protection" of Denmark, the enslavement of Norway, the swift extinction of Holland made us stir uneasily in our sleep. But it required the crashing of Hitler's armies through the Allied front in Belgium and France, and the frightful spectre of German victory over Britain, to blast us out of our dream.

Now that we are at last awakened, let us act with that confidence and courage which is characteristic of the American people at their best.

What can America do to assure the British victory which our people instinctively realize is the sole guarantee of American security?

There are those who say we can do nothing. But to pretend that the richest nation on this globe, blessed with natural resources promising unparalleled military strength, disposing of 45 per cent of the entire world's industrial power, and boasting a navy second to none, must sit impotent while her heritage of freedom is destroyed on battlefields a few thousand miles away is fantastic nonsense.

But the American people must first make up their minds that American liberties and the American way of life are worth fighting for; so immensely worth while that if other means fail they will not hesitate to send armies wherever and whenever they may be required to prevent complete and final overthrow of democratic self-government. So long as the nation's will-power is paralyzed by pacifist propaganda, carried on by "fifth column" emissaries of the totalitarian powers and by emotional and deluded advocates of non-resistance to aggression, so long as the American people are hypnotized by irresponsible politicians who pander to mob applause by proclaiming their "unalterable determination never to send American boys to Europe," nothing that we can say or do will discourage the enemies or encourage the friends of freedom.

That we will fight rather than permit eventual totalitarian victory is as certain as that the breath of freedom is in our nostrils. The only question is: Shall we boldly face that issue at once, and by deciding it now place ourselves in a strategic position to make the fighting unnecessary? Or shall we encourage the enemies of democracy in the delusion that we are too stupid to see where our vital interests lie, or too soft to defend them, thereby insuring continued aggression until we are forced to fight alone and against overwhelming odds?

It is possible for the United States to take several extremely effective steps at once:

(1) The President can immediately point out to Congress that events transpiring since our neutrality legislation was enacted have profoundly changed the whole world situation; that our vital interests, indeed our very ability to exist as a free people, are seriously threatened by the possibility of a German victory; that the German government has systematically pledged to each neutral strict respect for its neutral status in order to prevent all from concerting action for common defense, only to strike down each in turn by a surprise assault; that under these conditions the vital interests of this nation require that it immediately regain full liberty of action through repeal of its neutrality legislation, and that thus freed from restraint the government should frankly adopt a policy of non-belligerency benevolent toward Britain.

(2) Congress can promptly adopt the new legislation thus requested, thereby giving notice that the vast potential power of the United States has been cast into the balance on the side of free government.

(3) The government can make promptly available to Britain all planes, tanks, guns and other implements of war not immediately necessary to our protection under existing world conditions.

(4) It can release to the British military forces any secret devices perfected by us.

(5) It can encourage private industry to develop its resources for mass production to meet the needs of Britain and of our own defense program. If Henry Ford in a few months can equip one of his plants to turn out a thousand planes a day, he should be given all the means to do so.

(6) The government can immediately assume such control over exports as may be necessary to assure a swift and steady flow of supplies of every kind to Britain, and to prevent any from reaching Germany, directly or through other countries.

(7) It can remove obstacles which prevent American citizens from volunteering for service with the British armies.

(8) It can establish an initial credit of one billion dollars, immediately available to Britain for the purchase of arms, munitions and other implements of war; and can supplement this by further grants. If these grants were made as gifts from the American people, in recognition of the heroic suffering of the British armies, the good effect on the morale of both peoples would be instantaneous.

(9) Congress can repeal the Johnson Act, thereby permitting the British government to float loans in this country to be taken up by private subscription on the part of those who wish to aid British prosecution of the war.

(10) The government can take steps respecting American shipping to speed food, medicines, arms, munitions and other supplies to Britain. Government insurance of cargoes and vessels can be provided.

If measures such as these were speedily pushed to completion, the aid thereby rendered to the British cause would be tremendous.

If these measures were taken, there might be no need for American troops to participate in the struggle. In fact, the task of training, equipping and transporting a large army to Europe could not be accomplished without diverting from the British for long periods of time war materials which they may need more sorely than men.

Meanwhile, those who assure us that armed invasion of our own territory is as unthinkable as an attack from Mars apparently have forgotten that between 1812 and 1863 European navies and European armies on seven different occasions blockaded American sea ports, bombarded American coastal defenses, sailed up American rivers, ravaged with fire and sword, and, in one instance, burned the capital of the United States.

Those who fondly imagine that "it cannot happen here" forget that England, after nearly nine centuries of immunity, has come face to face with the possibility of invasion under modern conditions of warfare. They forget that the degree of

immunity we have thus far enjoyed has depended in no small measure on British control of the seas.

But invasion is not our only nor our chief danger.

Great Britain had not been invaded when she was driven to war despite patient and repeated efforts to appease Germany's insatiable appetite for conquest—efforts in which Mr. Chamberlain sacrified British national prestige, perhaps even British honor. France had not been invaded when, despite frantic efforts for peace, she like Great Britain was forced into war by an act of aggression far off in eastern Europe. Both Britain and France awakened at last to realization of the fact that their very existence as independent nations would be placed in jeopardy the moment Hitler, grown strong by conquest, was ready to hurl his mechanized legions against them. Theirs was the hard choice of fighting while there remained some chance of destroying the brutal enemy of democracy, or basely submitting to the subjugation of their countries.

British, as well as French, defeat in Europe would present the American people with precisely the same choice. Such defeat would quickly be followed by appearance of the totalitarian powers in our western hemisphere. This war is a world revolution in which several young, unscrupulous and immensely powerful governments are co-operating in a desperate effort to destroy old political institutions, and to impose on the whole world a new way of life. To these cynical revolutionists, it appears intolerable that "incompetent, blundering, decadent old nations" should inherit most of the

earth and its wealth, whereas "vigorous and efficient peoples of superior intelligence and ability" should play a secondary role.

When the first step is taken toward penetration of the western hemisphere, America will be faced with the necessity of making instant decision. If Canada is suddenly attacked in an effort to destroy the strongest remnant of the British Empire, we must immediately fight on Canadian soil, or repudiate the clear implications of the Monroe Doctrine and the specific pledge of protection given to Canada a few short months ago. In the latter case, the totalitarian monster would become solidly entrenched on our northern border, with the day of accounting but briefly postponed.

If it be Greenland, the West Indies, or some South American state that is the first object of Nazi or Fascist aggression, the fatal decision must equally be made. Either we fight, or we scuttle the Monroe Doctrine and run, leaving the aggressors to consolidate their positions for a later and more dangerous blow.

If the British people are compelled to sue for peace, the triumphant militaristic powers will almost certainly include in the terms imposed cession of "protective" military bases in the British Bermudas, in the British West Indies, and possibly in Central America (British Honduras). Should we decline to uphold the Monroe Doctrine by force, both the Panama Canal and the route of the proposed Nicaraguan Canal would be effectively dominated.

Should we elect to fight, we would do so without the aid of Britain and France, already defeated, and without the aid of the British dominions, with the possible exception of Canada. From the Latin American republics little, if any, effective help could reach us. We should have to fight far from our home bases, in areas skilfully selected by our antagonists. He is indeed an optimist who believes we would emerge victorious from such a contest.

The totalitarian powers would not long delay seizing that "living room," those rich colonial possessions, so long coveted in South America. Mexico with its boundless wealth in oil and metals, its weak government and endless internal strife, would soon require "protective occupation." Totalitarian military power would then be solidly entrenched upon our southern border. Across that border would be, within easy reach of mechanized land armies and air forces, the richest nation in the world, the only country still competent to challenge Germany's industrial supremacy, the last obstacle to full realization of the totalitarian dream of world conquest. Who can doubt that a final supreme blitzkrieg would soon be launched against the last survivor of the "decadent democracies"?

Vary the picture as we may, it remains something unspeakably dark and ugly for the American people to contemplate. With the free nations of Europe destroyed, and triumphant militarism let loose upon the world, no reasonable sequence of events can be conjured up which holds out any hope of a decent future for ourselves or for our children.

We are face to face with a world revolution in which one formidable military power, aided by other military powers, is fanatically determined to impose a certain philosophy of government upon the rest of mankind.

There has been developed in Europe a new and terrible version of that system of government which is based on the conception that the State is everything, Man nothing. Since "the State" consists of some leader who has fought his way to dictatorial power, supported by associates who find pleasure and profit in sharing such unlimited power, the fanatical devotion of the governing class to the new system is easily understood. Initial acceptance of the system by the governed is likewise understandable. For the dictator can act with ruthless efficiency, instituting reforms and securing benefits which under muddling democracy might long be delayed or never be realized. Once accepted, an efficient dictatorship strongly armed can be overthrown only with the greatest difficulty.

It is the unlimited power and the merciless efficiency of this type of government which make it dreaded by free men. All opposition is ruthlessly suppressed. In the interest of "the State" parliaments are reduced to impotence, political parties dissolved, labor unions proscribed, freedom of the press destroyed, freedom of religious worship denied. The minds of the people are enslaved by censorship. A reign of terror is exercised by all-powerful secret police.

If the horrors of such a government could be confined within its own borders, the rest of the world might go its way in peace. But dictatorial governments must enlarge their sway or perish. The dictators know that this small world of ours cannot exist half slave and half free. When a voice on the radio sweeps round the world in an instant of time, a free people is a constant challenge to any government which has enslaved its citizens.

And so it follows that totalitarian governments soon or late embark on military conquests. With hideous efficiency they inspire their women to breed "cannon fodder" within or without the marriage bond, train their youth to arms from early childhood, instill in their minds a lust for martial glory, and in their hearts fan flames of hatred against those they have most cause to envy. The whole economy of the state is bent to preparation for war.

On the battlefields of France the totalitarian state recently made its most desperate bid for world power. Britain and France, for years reluctant to engage in a mad armament race with Germany and Italy, found themselves hopelessly outclassed in air power and mechanized land arms, dangerously inferior in trained man power, and with sea power restricted by enemy superiority in the air.

If anyone is still so blind as to imagine that the European war cannot affect America so long as we keep out of it, let him ponder what has happened in this country at the mere threat of a German victory. Legislation appropriating added billions for defense is passed in a few hours with scarcely a dissenting voice. Industry is being mobilized in an attempt to turn out planes in unprecedented numbers. The army and navy are being enlarged. Taxes are being levied and the national debt limit raised to permit the borrowing of new billions. Laws are being passed to defeat "fifth column" penetration.

Do the American people realize what all this means to the American way of life? The present billions for defense, the present new taxes, the present restrictions on our democratic way of living, are only the first flurry of preparation, stimulated by the mere threat of a possible German victory. The achievement of that victory over Britain as well as France would force us into an orgy of armament.

Armaments cost billions, become obsolete in a few months or years, and must be replaced at the cost of more billions. The burden of taxation to support such a continuing program would be crushing. Here, as already abroad, private property would eventually be conscripted by the government to meet the staggering cost. Private industry would be commandeered. The citizen himself would be regimented. The whole structure of our government would be transformed. Democracy would be blacked out. The American way of life would be but a memory.

Totalitarianism, whether in the form of Nazism, Fascism or Communism means the total destruction of everything we have worked for and fought for in the past.

Were we tempted to distrust our own intuition as to the merits of this war, we could not do so in the light of the deep convictions of other democratic peoples. The Czechs and the Slovaks feared Germany, but had no fear of Britain or France. The Poles preferred the remote protection of Britain and France to the treacherous "protection" of neighboring Germany. Norway leaned over backward to maintain strict neutrality, but when forced to choose, sided with Britain and France. Holland and Belgium erected their defenses against the Germany they feared, not against Britain or France. The Balkan states live in terror of destruction by German or Italian or Russian aggression.

Intelligent Americans realize, furthermore, that our conceptions of personal liberty and civil rights stem from the Magna Carta, wrested from a reluctant king by courageous Englishmen. They know that Britons and Americans share a common tradition of freedom, developed through the centuries by the same forefathers. Knowing these things, Americans know that Britain is today fighting desperately to save from final destruction those personal, civil and religious liberties which alone make life tolerable to free men. Americans know that the triumph of Britain in the present deadly conflict is the only thing which can save America's future.

THE FORUM QUIZ

Compiled by

JO HUBBARD CHAMBERLIN

This quiz is planned to be a painless and amusing method of checking up on yourself, to find out how well-informed you are. It covers current events, politics, sports, business, literature and the arts and should not be difficult for the average person. Counting 2½ points for each question answered correctly, a grade school teacher scored 75, a housewife scored 72½, and a publicity man 85. Correct answers on page 63.

1. Most experts are inclined to give credit for the power of Hitler's drives to his:
(a) submarines which keep the British fleet far off shore.
(b) mechanized tank divisions
(c) mechanized tank divisions combined with bombers
(d) land mines

2. There's been a lot of news in the papers recently on the "frozen sleep" treatment, which is for:
(a) pneumonia (b) cancer (c) cholera (d) insanity

3. At a cocktail party there is a chap sitting on the divan with a bevy of beauties hanging on his every word. "Quite understandable," explains your host. "He's Gunther Smithers, the well-known herpetologist." "Oh," you reply,—
(a) "Something of a lounge lizard, eh?"
(b) "I suppose he collects birds."
(c) "He invented Herpicide for the hair."
(d) "Well, suppose he does understand Einstein's theory—what good does it do him?"

4. Not a few people were surprised when William Saroyan was awarded the 1940 Pulitzer prize for his diffuse and cloudy play, "The Time of Your Life," but not many were surprised when . . . . . was honored for his late, great novel:
(a) John Steinbeck *(b) Mark Van Doren*
(c) Carl Sandburg *(d) Ray Stannard Baker*

5. Which one of these metals is a liquid at ordinary temperatures?
(a) antimony (b) nickel (c) tungsten (d) mercury

6. Most authorities are now agreed that ordinary stuttering is due to:
(a) faulty diet
(b) over-eagerness to speak
(c) some physiological flaw
(d) nervous maladjustment

7. This one's not as easy as you might think. Please define accurately the meaning of "Fifth column":
(a) the Army's new marching formation, which abolishes "Squads right."
(b) spies set to watch one's own spies
(c) agents whose work is to corrupt, and pave the way for invaders
(d) the new mechanized tank divisions

8. Yes, we must keep up with American slang. When a dance orchestra is said to be "a bit corny," the speaker means:
(a) it comes from the corn belt
(b) it plays routine, standardized arrangements
(c) it plays exceptionally fast, for the jitterbugs

9. Because of the war, which one of these activities has vastly increased in scope?
(a) cartography (b) ichthyology (c) anthropology

10. Mussolini, who blusters and threatens more than any other head of a state, and with much less to back it up, often relies for his reasoning on a 15th century fellow countryman named:
(a) Leonardo da Vinci, an engineer as well as artist
(b) Machiavelli
(c) Benedetto Croce

11. One and only one of these statements is true:
(a) F.D.R. has finally balanced the budget
(b) Mrs. Roosevelt has decided to give up travelling
(c) Robert H. Jackson is now Attorney General

12. If one of Hitler's lightning strokes is called a blitzkrieg, then one of our own sitdown strikes might well be called a:
(a) witskrieg *(b) sitskrieg* *(c) nitskrieg*

13. As you read your evening newspaper, it seems a far cry from 1640 when the first . . . . was started in America, three centuries ago:
(a) newspaper *(c) gossip column*
(b) printing press *(d) book publishing firm*

14. Just as the U. S. has its West Point, so does France train its young officers at the famous:
(a) Ecole Marseilles *(b) St. Cyr* *(c) St. Vincent*

15. Poet, editor, and scholar—he's recently been serving as Librarian of Congress, and his name is:
(a) Thornton Wilder *(b) Archibald MacLeish*
(c) Stephen Vincent Benet *(d) Henry Luce*

16. Going over into the class of people who are distinguished for what they do rather than what they think, who has been the leading film box office attraction for the past year?
(a) Charles Laughton *(b) Vivian Leigh*
(c) Mickey Rooney *(d) Bette Davis*

17. Very probably you'll never reach it, but you ought to know that the perfect score at bowling is:
(a) 100 *(b) 260* *(c) 300* *(d) 500*

18. "Old Siwash" has come to be a handy phrase for any alma mater, but as a matter of fact it is a real college:
(a) Center College, in Kentucky
(b) Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois
(c) Amherst College in Massachusetts

19. Which one of these statements is FALSE?
(a) The U. S. Fleet is usually in the Atlantic.
(b) N. Y. City's new airport is named LaGuardia Field
(c) The "brown thrasher" is a bird, not a boxer

20. If Admiral Byrd, recently returned from the Antarctic, were to speak of the whales, penguins, and polar bears he had just seen there, you would know he was faking, because there are no . . . . . in the south pole regions:
(a) whales *(b) penguins* *(c) polar bears*

21. July, a vacation month, is a good one to be safety-conscious in. Now what about your auto brakes? When you double your rate of speed, you should expect that the distance in which your car can be brought to a stop will be:
(a) doubled *(b) trebled* *(d) quadrupled*

22. Yes, it was only lately that scientists discovered that sex hormones could be obtained from:
(a) sarsaparilla roots *(b) clams* *(c) carrots*
(d) mandrake *(e) sexagenarians*

23. Please quit skidding long enough to answer this one correctly. If your car starts to skid on a wet pavement the best thing to do is to:
(a) throw out the clutch and apply brakes sharply
(b) leave clutch in and apply brakes carefully
(c) shift into second gear and use the emergency brake

24. At a tea, a man comes into the room with his hat on

and proceeds to insult the host. He would be correctly defined as a:
(a) college man (b) a cad (c) a boor (d) a bore

25. Speaking of sport, there has been a trend in late years toward:
(a) indoor games such as squash racquets
(b) winter sports such as skiing and skating
(c) parlor games such as billiards, chess, etc.

26. Perhaps you have attended the circus this year, and have seen the lions and tigers—ferocious beasts, certainly. In a fight between them, which would most likely win?
(a) the tiger (b) the lion

27. One reason why the world as a whole should feel a debt to the American Indian is that he:
(a) helped bring maize, or corn, to its present high stage of development
(b) spread apple trees all over the U. S.
(c) first grew wheat in America

28. And while we're speaking of cereals, which one does ordinary bran come from?
(a) corn (b) wheat (c) oats (d) barley

29. "We have met the enemy and they are ours" was first said by:
(a) Adolf Hitler (b) John Paul Jones
(c) Admiral Dewey (d) Admiral Perry

30. Mr. Henley once wrote a poem called "Invictus," and high school seniors have, unfortunately, been reciting it ever since, so perhaps you'll have no trouble filling in the missing words:

"It matters not . . . . the gate,
How charged with punishment the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul."

(a) "who's given" (b) "how broad"
(c) "how strait" (d) "how high"

31. Judging by recent polls and surveys it is reasonably clear that Father Coughlin's popularity:
(a) is at a new low
(b) is vastly increasing
(c) is what it was about 1933-1934

32. At the present time it is obvious that the federal debt is close to, or has really passed the statutory limit of:
(a) $35,000,000,000 (b) $45,000,000,000
$55,000,000,000

33. In the headlines for the past three or four years have been appearing the words "Mt. Palomar," which is becoming well-known as the site of the new:
(a) "Big eye" telescope
(b) Cal. Inst. of Technology cyclotron
(c) University of S. California campus

34. Which one of these fellows seems to avoid living with other members of his society?
(a) a fish (b) a poet (c) an anchorite (d) a bivalve

35. You can be sure that a certain European dictator with a black mustache knows that a majority of Switzerland's population speak:
(a) French (b) Swiss (c) German (d) Italian

36. Which of these statements is TRUE?
(a) The word status is pronounced stā - tus.
(b) The New York Times *has the largest circulation in the U. S.*
(c) Chico Marx is the one who says nothing.
(d) Pizzicato means muting the strings.

37. And which of these statements is FALSE?
(a) Charles Burchfield often paints old houses.
(b) The Schick test is for diphtheria.
(c) Harold J. Laski writes good murder yarns.

38. If you happen to make an auto trip into Canada during July or August, it is necessary to take along your:
(a) passport (b) birth certificate
(c) hot water bottle (d) car registration

39. Out in Hollywood there's one man in charge of censorship for the Hays office. He is a stout Irishman named:
(a) John O'Hara (b) Joe Breen (c) Michael Todd

40. And finally, what poet wrote the following famous lines:

"We Are Seven"
"—A simple Child,
That lightly draws its breath,
And feels its life in every limb,
What should it know of death?"

(a) William Wordsworth (b) John Keats
(c) P. B. Shelley

(CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM magazine will pay $3 for any FORUM QUIZ question which is submitted by a reader and used by CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM magazine. Questions should be sent to *Forum Quiz*, care of CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM, 366 Madison Avenue, N. Y. C. All questions become the property of the magazine and no questions will be returned. If the same question is submitted by more than one person the first received will be awarded the cash prize.)

Death Over England

—Condensed from The News Review *of London*

Up Reigate Hill, Surrey, toiled a stooping man dressed in filthy clothes, with a grimy face and a set of sweep's brushes over his shoulder. A special constable chatting with two road-line painters noticed his ears were unusually clean. "You're no sweep," he said. "No," replied the mystery man. He made matters worse by adding that he was a clergyman.

Searched for hidden guns or bombs, the "sweep" was marched to the police station at Kingswood village. There he was identified as the Rev. John ten Bruggenkate, a curate, who had disguised himself to exercise his troop of Boy Scouts in paratroop detection.

Britain's new Local Defense Volunteer Corps, a citizen army to combat parachutists, was a recent revolution on the Home Front. Twenty-four hours after War Minister Anthony Eden's radio appeal for men, a quarter of a million had signed on.

An attempted German invasion of the British Isles seems a fantastic project on the face of it, but Hitler is clearly not waging war by the military textbooks.

A few years ago, when the Red Army first demonstrated on the Moscow airfield mass parachute troop-landings, British observers chuckled openly. Even when 12,000 heavily armed German soldiers dropped from the skies of Holland to spread death and horror, the skeptics were unconvinced.

"Well, it can't happen here," they said.

Yet recent dispatches from usually well-informed quarters in Paris stated that Adolf Hitler is dead-set on an invasion of the British Isles, and has had plans drawn up by the Committee of Cooperation of the Nazi General Staffs.

Principal author of this document is said to be Air Minister Hermann Goering.

According to reports Goering maintains that mass aerial attacks on Britain would stiffen the morale of the people, and bring the Reich no nearer ultimate victory, unless carried out as part of a comprehensive scheme of attack.

His report envisages a series of ferocious air bombardments to destroy coastal defenses, cripple communications and sow disorder in industrial regions.

Simultaneously, parachutists would be dropped on England.

Simultaneously, also, every ship which Germany could press into use as a troop carrier would be sent across the North Sea blanketed by U-boats and fighter-escorted bomber squadrons.

From Netherlands ports operations would be aimed against eastern and southern England, while another expeditionary force from Norway would make its way to the west coast of Eire for a surprise landing there.

'Gainst England

—Song written by Hermann Loens, German soldier killed in the World War; it is now popular among German soldiers occupying ports on the English Channel.

Today a song we'll sing,
We'll drink the cool sweet wine
And let our glasses clink
For orders came to part.

CHORUS

Give me your hand, your dear white hand,
Farewell, my sweetest love,
Farewell, my sweet, farewell;
Farewell, for we sail, farewell for we sail,
For we sail 'gainst England.

VERSE

Our flag, see it wave from the mast,
Of Germany's strength it speaks,
We want to halt at last
The Englishman's sneering laugh.
(Chorus)

VERSE

Should tidings come of my fall,
Of my sleep in ocean's floods,
Don't weep over me at all,
For the fatherland flows my blood.
(Chorus)

"Plutocratic Poison"

—Condensed from an article in the newspaper Lavoro Fascista, *Rome*

In entering the field against the Allies to affirm by arms the rights of proletarian peoples against the capitalistic democracies, Italy had to expect that the representatives of plutocratic capitalism, of Judaism and Masonry, would spray her with accumulated poison on the day the revolutions of Mussolini and Hitler began to disturb their digestion. Here they are all together, the pontiffs of capitalistic democracies, the haves who are again belittling warlike and laborious Italy.

Here are the immoral preservers of monstrous privileges speaking of morality; here are the avaricious professors, who are seeking to suffocate the life of the peoples, speaking of liberty; here are those who are foreigners to Europe, for historic and geographic reasons, speaking of defending Europe; here are the greatest champions of ignorance, typical of people who enriched themselves quickly without any spiritual preparations, speaking of philosophy.

South America Next?

—From an article by George Duhamel which appeared in Le Figaro, *a daily, of Paris, just before Germany's capture of that city*

The nations of South America are at peace. They do not maintain ruinous armies. Their fleets are surely not gigantic. Why should they be? England polices the seas and will certainly not abuse her power to make a sudden attack on their sovereignty. Under such conditions the countries of South America may not only continue to carry on their work but even dream of happiness.

They can dream at any rate as long as the unfortunate European democracies hold the monster at bay. For if the monster succeeds in his mad enterprise, then surely what I call Plan B 87 will be brought out. It is only too easy for us to outline this plan.

In the early days of April, 194.., at the beginning of the subequatorial autumn, a very mild season for North Europeans, a fleet composed of ten dreadnoughts, twenty cruisers and fifty destroyers preceding fifty transport ships, a fleet coming from all points of the compass and assembled as if by a miracle on the empty Atlantic, suddenly appears before the bay of Rio de Janeiro. Prominent persons, Fifth Columnists who had settled in the Brazilian capital months or years before, inform the government that Germany demands the freedom of the bay, the right to land an expeditionary force, control of the railroads and the mails, and the immediate surrender of all of Brazil south of Parallel 15, about 1,875,000 square miles, where the principal mineral and industrial wealth of the country is located.

LEWIS—The Milwaukee Journal

Underground Stuff

At this point in my prophetic dream I stop for a moment. I have delightful memories of Brazil and of Rio. The Brazilian people inspire the traveler with a feeling tinged with tenderness. They are on the whole courteous and friendly; they love true civilization, literature, science and art. I think of them each day with gratitude and I thank them for being what they are. But if ever a triumphant Germany put into execution what I call in my imagination Plan B 87, beautiful, sweet Brazil would have nothing to do but bow in haste. Strong through its traditions, defended by its very size and by its humane and conciliatory genius, Brazil, seventeen times larger than France, maintains in normal times an army of fifty thousand men and twenty odd warships, large and small. This is entirely sufficient for the future, if Germany is beaten. It is a cardboard armor and a toy pistol if Germany comes out of the war with her aggressive power intact.

I could just as well have spoken of Uruguay or of Argentina—Plans B 88 and B 89, or of still other countries which live far from our inferno and do not smell its smoke. I feel obliged to shout to all these friendly peoples today: Either the Allies will be victorious, and you can continue to live happily and wisely in your magnificent countries. Or else we shall be defeated. I do not believe it, but that is still within the realm of the imagination, and in this case, arm yourselves to the teeth and prepare to suffer.

It's in the Stars

—Condensed from an article by Robert Lynd in The New Statesman and Nation, *London*

I am one of those who can never skip the astrology feature in a Sunday paper. Sometimes I am shocked when I consider the increasing hold that astrology is getting on modern men and women, but, nonetheless, I wonder whether I myself am as skeptical about the stars and their influences as I ought to be.

It would be a good thing, it seems to me, if a scientific committee were set up to examine the past predictions of astrologers and their proved truth or falsity. The astrologers themselves tell us mainly of their successes. There was an astrologer last year who foretold that English men and women would have a pleasant surprise in the 1940 budget, as there would be remissions of taxation owing to a slackening in the armaments race.

There was a French astrologer who in 1934 claimed to have foretold the death of M. Barthou at the time of the assassination of King Alexander of Yugoslavia, and who, elated by his triumph, forecast the end of Mussolini, described as "a man fatally stricken." Mussolini's day of destiny, he declared, was January 27, 1936, after which, according to the stars, his fall would be rapid.

Again, at a meeting of English

astrologers in 1936, a peaceful settlement of the European situation and drastic changes in the Government of Italy were predicted.

Astrologers, of course, do not always agree among themselves. The personal element enters even into the interpretation of the message of the stars. Wishful thinkers will be glad to learn, however, that there is one matter on which all astrologers are said to be agreed—the downfall of Adolf Hitler.

I cannot deny that this prediction gives me pleasure; but a lingering skepticism makes me wonder whether "all astrologers" includes all German astrologers. We are often told that Herr Hitler himself is a believer in astrology and that his actions are greatly influenced by readings of the heavens. Did his astrologers fear to speak the truth last September or did they simply bungle the interpretation?

Or was Herr Hitler mad enough to believe Herr von Ribbentrop rather than the astrologers? A wise man would always pin more faith to the word of an astrologer than to the word of Herr von Ribbentrop.

What's a Flag?

—An editorial which appeared in The New York Times

What's a flag? What's the love of country for which it stands? Maybe it begins with love of the land itself. It is the fog rolling in with the tide at Eastport, or through the Golden Gate and among the towers of San Francisco. It is the sun coming up behind the White Mountains, over the Green, throwing a shining glory on Lake Champlain and above the Adirondacks. It is the storied Mississippi rolling swift and muddy past St. Louis, rolling past Cairo, pouring down past the levees of New Orleans. It is lazy noon-tide in the pines of Carolina, it is a sea of wheat rippling in Western Kansas, it is the San Francisco peaks far north across the glowing nakedness of Arizona, it is the Grand Canyon and a little stream coming down out of a New England ridge, in which are trout.

It is men at work. It is the storm-tossed fishermen coming into Gloucester and Provincetown and Astoria. It is the farmer riding his great machine in the dust of harvest, the dairyman going to the barn before sunrise, the lineman mending the broken wire, the miner drilling for the blast. It is the servants of fire in the murky splendor of Pittsburgh, between the Allegheny and the Monongahela, the trucks rumbling through the night, the locomotive engineer bringing the train in on time, the pilot in the clouds, the riveter running along the beam a hundred feet in air. It is the clerk in the office, the housewife doing the dishes and sending the children off to school. It is the teacher, doctor and parson tending and helping, body and soul, for small reward.

It is small things remembered, the little corners of the land, the houses, the people that each one loves. We love our country because there was a little tree on a hill, and grass thereon, and a sweet valley below; because the hurdy-gurdy man came along on a sunny morning in a city street; because a beach or a farm or a lane or a house that might not seem much to others were once, for each of us, made magic. It is voices that are remembered only, no longer heard. It is parents, friends, the lazy chat of street and store and office, and the ease of mind that makes life tranquil. It is Summer and Winter, rain and sun and storm. These are flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood, a lasting part of what we are, each of us and all of us together.

It is stories told. It is the Pilgrims dying in their first dreadful Winter. It is the minute man standing his ground at Concord Bridge, and dying there. It is the army in rags, sick, freezing, starving at Valley Forge. It is the wagons and the men on foot going westward over Cumberland Gap, floating down the great rivers, rolling over the great plains. It is the settler hacking fiercely at the primeval forest on his new, his own lands. It is Thoreau at Walden Pond, Lincoln at Cooper Union, and Lee riding home from Appomattox. It is corruption and disgrace, answered always by men who would not let the flag lie in the dust, who have stood up in every generation to fight for the old ideals and the old rights, at risk of ruin or of life itself.

It is a great multitude of people on pilgrimage, common and ordinary people, charged with the usual human failings, yet filled with such a hope as never caught the imaginations and the hearts of any nation on earth before. The hope of liberty. The hope of justice. The hope of a land in which a man can stand straight, without fear, without rancor.

The land and the people and the flag—the land a continent, the people of every race, the flag a symbol of what humanity may aspire to when the wars are over and the barriers are down; to these each generation must be dedicated and consecrated anew, to defend with life itself, if need be, but, above all, in friendliness, in hope, in courage, to live for.

Amsterdam's Diamonds

—Condensed from an article in The American Hebrew

The Nazi occupation of Holland and of parts of Belgium was, as far as the Jews were concerned, a repetition of the invasion of Poland: the same scenes of inhuman cruelty and destruction during the invasion itself, the same relentless pursuit and machine-gunning of the civilian refugees by Nazi planes and the same methods of Gestapo arrests and tortures and despoiling of the Jewish population after the invasion has been completed and the country "pacified."

The chief effort of the Gestapo seems to be centered on preventing particularly the Jewish diamond merchants of Antwerp and Amsterdam from taking their valuables abroad. Antwerp and Amsterdam, as is well known, were the centers of the diamond trade in the world, and those engaged in it were chiefly Jews. Apart from their great value as precious stones, diamonds have a special significance at present for certain industries connected with the war.

It was therefore of treble importance for the Gestapo to make a special drive against the diamond merchants: firstly to confiscate the great wealth of that industry; secondly to pauperize the Jews engaged in it; and thirdly to obtain the precious stones for the Nazi war industry. This, it appears, was the main reason for Himmler's rush to Amsterdam as

soon as the Germans occupied the city.

Hundreds of diamond merchants, Jews and non-Jews, were arrested during the first days of the invasion and the well known scenes of Gestapo torture are now in full swing. A wave of suicides among Jews is already sweeping through the city and is reaching the same heights as in Vienna after the Nazi invasion of Austria.

It can, however, be said with confidence that this time the Nazis were late with their swoop, for the bulk of the diamond stocks had been removed to England in good time.

In Conquered Poland

—Condensed from an article by Androzej Waligorski in The Contemporary Review, *London*

Adequately to discuss the processes being employed by the Nazis in Poland is not easy. Most of them are only in their initial stages. Further, what I myself saw, before escaping in November, is now out of date, and precise information is scarce. It is difficult for a Pole to write without emotion of what is going on in his country, yet only cold analysis can really meet the case.

In our examination of the relations established between the victorious Germans and the vanquished Poles, the most useful framework in which to picture those relations is that of a system of castes. No reciprocity is permitted. A barrier is set to social contacts; the caste favors one group and disqualifies the other. The one is superior, the other inferior; and the norms of behavior of each are sternly regulated.

Intercourse between the groups is forbidden; Germans are to keep Poles at arm's length. The *Oberpresident* of East Prussia issued decrees early in January to this effect. "Personal relations" are not permitted with prisoners of war. These include sitting at the same table, or even in the same room, inviting prisoners to a bar or a restaurant or even serving them there, being in their company at a church service. But the rules apply just as much to civilian Poles also. Posters were stuck on the walls in Western Poland: "Poles must now use the servants' entrance!"

Intermarriage is forbidden, and the lower caste is deprived of the right to marry at all. This was made clear by the Protestant Bishop of Poznan, though I very much doubt whether any attempt can be made to enforce it. Irregular intercourse between the two castes is severely dealt with. A German girl of 22, having "insulted the honour of a German woman," was sent to prison for six years, and her hair was cut off by the *Gauleiter*. On the other hand the exploitation of the "native" woman is encouraged.

What has happened to the intelligentsia since the Nazi conquest? Deprived of its former income, very often a state-paid salary, it must seek other means of support. Only two openings are left: manual labor, and the petty trading which means chiefly selling one's possessions. Not everyone, however, is fit for manual labor; and the trading can only last until the stocks end. The result is that most of the intelligentsia will either enlist voluntarily or will be drafted for state-controlled labor. They will then be carried off to the Reich, to what might be called the white slavery of the twentieth century.

The position of the working classes is hardly better. During the first few months not many of them were unemployed, but this condition is now virtually ended, and most of them will be compelled to migrate. This temporary period of employment was chiefly due to the fact that most of Poland's heavy industry was not destroyed, thanks to the swift progress of the war; and having important stocks of raw materials (calculated to keep them going for about three months), they offered profitable booty to the Germans if operated on the spot until these stocks were exhausted. For a time they were running at full capacity, but we know of more and more now closing down, with machinery being dismantled and transported to Germany or sold to the Soviets.

The workers, of course, are helpless, and are at the mercy of those who seek to enroll them for the Reich. Exact figures cannot be given as to the number of Polish laborers being taken by force to the Reich. Swiss papers report an average of two or three trains leaving Warsaw daily. They estimate the total number, apart from 300,000 war prisoners already in Germany, at not less than one million workers of both sexes.

There is still another factor draining the resources of the Polish countryside. I refer to the host of German officials of all kinds, taking up various kinds of posts—civilian, administrative, economic, both in town and country. They are little less than parasites. It is for this kind of thing that taxes are imposed; but on top of taxation come frequent and severe fines. These are easily inflicted, cannot be resisted, and rob the pockets of the Polish people.

It is the position of the peasants which has relatively least changed. They may even draw momentary advantages from the fact of belonging to the highly industrialized German Reich. They are likely to obtain beter prices for all produce, although in view of the general shortage of goods they will not be able to buy much with their money. As a result they will avoid selling for cash, but will do their best to get goods directly in exchange. Though it is forbidden, they will try to smuggle to the market town a little wheat or rye or flour, for which they can get sugar, soap, salt or paraffin oil for lighting. These goods, of course, are also rationed, and often cannot be had for cash, but some smuggling is always possible.

"Goering Loves Peace"

—Extracted from an article in Vecko-Journalen, *Stockholm weekly, by Count Eric von Rosen, brother of Field Marshal Goering's first wife, now dead*

A fighter for peace on the other side, Hermann Goering is close to me through family relationship. I know him as a man who loves peace with all his heart and who has wide cultural interests.

He is a strong man who stands by his word. He is faithful in friendship, has a good heart and is ready to help.

The Field Marshal has been a great help to Sweden in these serious times. He is genuinely attached to Sweden, the native country of his first wife.

What he can do for Sweden he has done, with the help of Hitler, and I am convinced he will always

work in that direction. Sweden can count on the goodwill that Marshal Goering in collaboration with Hitler will always have for us.

To the Brink

—Condensed from a St. Louis Post-Dispatch *editorial, of which the editors say: "Never before has there come to the* Post-Dispatch *office such an outpouring of sentiment as that in support of our criticism of President Roosevelt's virtual call to arms."*

President Roosevelt all but declared war in his speech at the University of Virginia.

He did not go all the way because, fortunately, this is still a democracy and, under our system, only the Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the people, can declare war.

But the President, with his immense power, can lead the nation to the brink. This is what Roosevelt has done.

The President opened his speech with the words: "Every generation of young men and women in America has questions to ask the world."

While the country is still at least technically at peace, while the Bill of Rights is still functioning, we are going to take advantage of it and ask the President some questions.

But, first of all, we should like to draw a very brief contrast between Franklin Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Wilson led the United States into war in 1917 after a long period in which he did his agonizing best to keep us out of it. He led us into war only after a long series of overt acts by Germany against the United States—the sinking of our ships and the killing of our citizens.

This time there are no overt acts by Germany against the United States. Our ships are not being sunk. Our people are not being killed. Roosevelt, however, is doing his agonizing best to get us into the war. And he is doing so without the approval of public opinion. In contrast with the situation in 1917, we can now measure public opinion accurately. All the pools show that the people of the United States are overwhelmingly opposed to going to war.

Duffy—*The Baltimore Sun*

Coloring It Drop by Drop

Is this a democracy or isn't it? Are the people or their elected representatives to be consulted on a question of the utmost gravity—a question that involves the blood of American men—or not?

Is it not true that Roosevelt has proceeded along the very lines that Mussolini did, namely, to work up a war fever without permitting the Italian people to express their true convictions?

Is it not true that, for a year or more, Roosevelt has been so obsessed with foreign policy as to neglect domestic issues and, worse, as to neglect the proper economic and military preparation of our country for the trying times that may be ahead?

Mr. Roosevelt, of course, sincerely believes that the defeat of Britain would endanger the United States, and this sentiment is shared by millions of his countrymen, including this newspaper, but what is the sensible thing to do under the circumstances? Is it to enter the war in Europe or is it to build up our own defenses in a rational way?

If we assume, for the sake of discussion, that this country is ready and willing to follow Roosevelt into a European war, with what will the country fight?

Will it fight with an army which is microscopic compared to the great legions of Germany and Italy? Will it fight with its navy and leave the Pacific bare to the marauding ships of Japan? Will it fight with its handful of anti-aircraft guns, not sufficient in number to guard even one moderately sized city? Will it fight with its 300 B-18 bombers, of which Gen. Arnold, chief of our air force, said to send them into battle would be suicide? Will it fight with its few so-called flying fortresses, which are now revealed to have three vital defects?

Obviously not. Far from being able to fight in Europe, the United States is actually unprepared to defend its own shores. And why, since this is the undeniable fact, does Roosevelt all but declare war on the dictators? His fifth cousin said: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." This Roosevelt speaks loudly and has nothing to back it up.

PEASE—The Newark Evening News

"How soon can we back it up?"

Has the President read the recently issued report of the Senate Naval Committee, which says that for the United States to go to war would mean a tragic sacrifice of the nation's liberties and assets? Does he know that the committee, after carefully interviewing high-ranking officers of our armed forces, says that the United States is not prepared to give Britain concrete help by intervening now, and will only jeopardize its own welfare by doing so?

The Naval Committee's report should be required reading for the President. It asks a question, too. It asks: "Why not face the basic *military and economic* fact that it is not within our power or means to create military or naval establishments of sufficient strength to police the world, but that it is within our power and means to prevent others from transporting their wars to this hemisphere?"

Mr. Roosevelt talks about the European shambles in terms of words like justice, freedom, liberty. Those are precious words and those are precious things, but is it not true that the war in Europe is concerned about many other things besides abstract principles?

Is it not true that the war started in September of last year when Hitler invaded Poland and the declared reason for the entrance of France and Britain was to protect Poland! Was Poland a democracy? Ask the poor peasants of Poland, crushed under the heels of the Polish landlords, about that. Ask the Jews of Poland, who suffered the Polish brand of pogrom before Hitler's was invented.

Justice, freedom, liberty, yes! These were the things we went to war for in 1917 and what happened? Instead of making the world safe for democracy, we ushered in the era of dictatorships, the age of the monstrous Hitler, the ghoulish Mussolini.

Is it not true that we are witnessing in Europe a tremendous convulsion of forces, of rival imperialisms, of have-not nations versus have nations of age-old hatreds, of age-old quarrels? Is it not a radical over-simplification of a vast historical upheaval to describe it in the terms used by Mr. Roosevelt?

Mr. Roosevelt did his best to keep the war from happening. He failed. Now his job is to be President of the United States of America.

Viennese Appetites Provoke Nazi Irony

—*Condensed from the* Voelkischer Beobachter, *of Vienna*

To judge by the two hundred thousand requests for treatment which are at present being examined at the city's medical centers, there are some two hundred thousand people ill in Vienna, quite apart from those in hospitals and sanatoria. According to this reckoning, every tenth Viennese man and every tenth Viennese woman is ailing. True, they jog happily along through the daily round, carry on their business or go to their cafés—nevertheless, they are ill. Their illnesses are of such a terrible nature that no ordinary therapeutic means can put the patient on his feet. No ultra-violet ray or medicine can help him. The only things which save these sufferers from certain collapse are salami sausages, Prague ham, cream, and real Jamaican coffee.

They tell tales with haggard, drawn faces of serious operations from which they have just recovered and from whose consequences they are still suffering. In order not to collapse completely, they need at least twelve pints of pure milk, seven or eight pounds of meat, and fourteen eggs every week. Sometimes they speak of a form of T.B. which they have had since youth. The effects of this malady can, of course, only be endured by taking extra rations, preferably cream and fats. They are too, of course, always "terribly highly-strung." Three cups of genuine strong coffee daily are necessary to master their unsteady nerves.

"No other troubles?" inquires the doctor.

"But of course!" Any number of additional ills can be produced if it is a question of extra provisions. Some are diabetic, others have stomach troubles, and those with anatomical knowledge even duodenal ulcers. But, unfortunately for them, the doctor knows his "flock," and puts them under the microscope. What a shame!

The Might of the U.S. Now to Be Organized

—Condensed from an editorial in The Army and Navy Journal

The President and the Congress have confided to the Services a task of historic magnitude—the organization and direction of the might of the United States for the security of the Nation and its vital material and spiritual interests. It is a task that comprehends not only our home and insular territories, but the whole of the Western Hemisphere.

Now that the world is in flames, the Treasury door is wide open, and the pennies that would have been of such value in building the essential foundation have grown into dollars to be feverishly spent so that overnight there can be created planes and guns and trained Armies, superior to those Germany is using.

But while this miracle cannot be wrought without time, the speed for which the President called will be given. It will be given because of the preparation the Services have made for just this situation, preparations based upon leadership, education and cooperation. The country now will come to realize the high professional quality of its officers who in the Army have passed through the Schools of the Arms, the Command and General Staff School and the War College, and who in the Navy have graduated from the Post Graduate School at Annapolis and the Naval War College, and who together have learned the problems of industry and cooperation therewith at the Army Industrial College.

Then, too, is the actual staff work which has been done over the years, work done by so-called Brass Hats, who have used the means available to the best advantage for present duty and future probabilities.

Lines Written in Passion and in Deep Concern for England, France and My Own Country

By EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY

(Poem which Miss Millay submitted to several newspapers in mid-June)

DEAR ISOLATIONIST, you are
So very, very insular!
Surely you do not take offense?—
The word's well used in such a sense.
'Tis you, not I, sir, who insist
You are an Isolationist.

And oh, how sweet a thing to be
Safe on an island, not at sea!
(Though someone said, some months ago—
I heard him, and he seemed to know;
Was it the German Chancellor?
"There *are* no islands any more.")

Dear Islander, I envy you:
I'm very fond of islands, too;
And few the pleasures I have known
Which equaled being left alone.
Yet matters from without intrude
At times upon my solitude:
A forest fire, a dog run mad,
A neighbor stripped of all he had
By swindlers, or the shrieking plea
For help, of stabbed Democracy.

Startled, I rise, run from the room,
Join the brigade of spade and broom;
Help to surround the sickened beast;
Hear the account of farmers fleeced
By dapper men, condole, and give
Something to help them hope and live:
Or, if Democracy's at stake,
Give more, give more than I can make;
And notice, with a rueful grin,
What was without, is now within.

(The tidal wave devours the shore:
There *are* no islands any more.)

With sobbing breath, with blistered hands,
Men fight the forest fire in bands;
With kitchen broom, with branch of pine,
Beat at the blackened, treacherous line;
Before the veering wind fall back,
With eyebrows burnt and faces black;
While breasts in blackened streams perspire,
Watch how the wind runs with the fire
Like a broad banner up the hill—
And can no more . . . yet more must still.

New life!—to hear across the field
Voices of neighbors, forms concealed
By smoke, but loud the nearing shout,
"Hold on! We're coming! Here it's out!"

(The tidal wave devours the shore:
There *are* no islands any more.)

This little life, from here to there—
Who lives it safely anywhere?
Not you, my insulated friend:
What calm composure will defend
Your rock, when tides you've never seen
Assault the sands of What-has-been,
And from your island's tallest tree,
You watch advance What-is-to-be?

(The tidal wave devours the shore:
There *are* no islands any more.)

Sweet, sweet, to see the tide approach,
Assured that it cannot encroach
Upon the beach-peas, often wet
With spray, never uprooted yet.
The moon said—did she not speak true?—
"The waves will not awaken you.
At my command the waves retire.
Sleep, weary mind: dream, heart's desire."

And yet, there was a Danish king
So sure he governed everything
He bade the ocean not to rise.
It did. And great was his surprise.
No man, no nation, is made free
By stating it intends to be.
Jostled and elbowed is the clown
Who thinks to walk alone in town.
We live upon a shrinking sphere—
Like it or not, our home is here:
Brave heart, uncompromising brain
Could make it seem like home again.

(There *are* no islands any more.
The tide that mounts our drowsy shore
Is boats and men,—there is no place
For waves in such a crowded space!)

Oh, let us give, before too late,
To those who hold our country's fate
Along with theirs—be sure of this—
In grimy hands,—that will not miss
The target, if we stand beside
Loading the guns—(resentment, pride,
Debts torn across with insolent word—
All this forgotten, or deferred
At least until there's time for strife
Concerning things less dear than Life;
Then let, if must be, in the brain
Resentment rankle once again,
Quibbling and Squabbling take the floor,
Cool Judgement go to sleep once more.)

On English soil, on French terrain,
Democracy's at grips again
With forces forged to stamp it out.
This time no quarter!—since no doubt.
Not France, not England's what's involved,
Not we—there's something to be solved
Of grave concern to free men all:
Can Freedom stand? Must Freedom fall?

(Meantime, the tide devours the shore:
There *are* no islands any more.)

Oh, build, assemble, transport, give,
That England, France and we may live,
Before tonight, before too late,
To those who hold our country's fate
In desperate fingers, reaching out
For weapons we confer about,
All that we can, and more, and now!
Oh, God! Let not the lovely brow
Of Freedom in the trampled mud
Grow cold! Have we no brains, no blood,
No enterprise—no any thing
Of which we proudly talk and sing,
Which we like men can bring to bear
For Freedom, and against Despair?
Lest French and British fighters, deep
In battle, needing guns and sleep,
For lack of aid be overthrown,
And we be left to fight alone.

Chronology of the European War

MAY 20—British planes bomb German oil refineries and oil stores in Hamburg, Bremen and Hanover.
—Foreign Minister Ciano warns Italy that participation in the war is imminent.

MAY 21—The Germans drive a spearhead to the English Channel, cutting off Allied troops in Belgium and the northwest tip of France from the main body of the French army. It is estimated that 500,000 men have thus been trapped.
—Premier Reynaud says the inefficient handling of General Andrea Corap's army is responsible for France's plight and adds that "unbelievable faults" will be punished.
—Alfred Duff Cooper, Minister of Information, warns Britons by radio to expect invasion at any time.

MAY 22—The Allies strike back at the German invaders in fierce attempts to free their troops bottled up in northern France and Belgium. Premier Reynaud of France declares "if we hold for a month—and we shall hold for as long as is necessary—we shall have covered three-fourths of the road to victory."
—An unprecedented measure gives the Churchill government full power over British industry, property and labor to insure the maximum war effort.
—The United States notifies all belligerents that the liner *President Roosevelt* will sail for Ireland to bring Americans from the war zone, and that she is not to be touched.

MAY 23—Prime Minister Churchill bravely tells Commons that the Nazi drive on the Channel ports is succeeding and threatening the British line of communications with the B.E.F. in Belgium.
—Cracking down upon suspected enemies within the gates, Britain arrests suspected Fifth Columnists including Sir Oswald Mosley, British Fascist leader.
—Attorney General Jackson announces a nation-wide registration of 3,500,000 aliens in the United States. Meanwhile, Communists and Bundists are barred from relief as the House passes a $1,111,754,916 relief bill.

MAY 24—King George VI, addressing his 500,000,000 subjects, warns that Hitler's aim is conquest of the world and says that, if Britain is defeated, it will mean "the destruction of the world as we have known it and the descent of darkness upon its ruins."
—In Washington the House, by a vote of 391 to 1, passes a defense bill to allow unlimited expansion of the Army Air Corps after President Roosevelt announces plans for training 50,000 volunteer pilots during the fiscal year starting July 1.

MAY 25—Berlin claims that the Allied armies north of the German spearhead to the Channel are completely cut off and that the next objective will be to cut the trapped forces into small detachments and dispose of them piecemeal.
—Fifteen French generals are relieved of their commands by General Weygand in a sensational shake-up.

MAY 26—Boulogne, important channel port, through which the British Expeditionary Force entered France and Belgium, is lost by the French.
—General Sir Edmund Ironside, Chief of the British Imperial Staff, is replaced by Lieutenant General Sir John Greer Dill, tank and bomber expert. Ironside becomes Commander-in-Chief of the Home Forces.

MAY 27—Admitting that the situation in northern France is of increasing gravity, London reports that German bombers are attacking Channel shipping, attempting to slash the British supply line to Flanders.
—In an effort to keep Italy out of the war London reports that Italian ships will be exempt from blockade search under an agreement by which no goods received in Italy would be re-exported to Germany. Nevertheless, Italy openly prepares for war.

MAY 28—A stunning blow is delivered to the Allies when the Belgian army capitulates before the German advance, on orders of King Leopold. Premier Reynaud of France calls Leopold's action "without precedent in history." He tells his countrymen that France's faith in victory is still intact.

MAY 29—The Allies attempt to evacuate as many troops as possible from the German pocket in Flanders. The port of Dunkerque is still in Allied hands, and transports wait to take away Allied soldiers.
—The Allies capture Narvik in northern Norway.
—Britain attempts to woo Russia away from Germany. Sir Stafford Cripps, Left-Wing Labor member of Parliament, is named "special trade envoy" to Moscow.
—Fears of Nazi Fifth Column activities in South America cause President Baldomir of Uruguay to sponsor two bills, one for rearmament and the other denying the right of assembly to anti-democratic groups with foreign connections.
—President Roosevelt, in view of what has happened in Flanders, reappraises American defense plans and decides to ask Congress for $750,000,000 in addition to the $3,300,000,000 already projected.

MAY 30—Uncounted thousands of British, French and Belgian troops land in England under the protection of the guns of the British navy while their comrades fight fierce rear guard actions against superior Nazi air and land forces in Flanders.
—Mobilization of the Italian army continues.
—Adrien Arcand, leader of the Fascist-minded National Unity party of Quebec, is arrested with nine of his aides as Canada continues to drive against Fifth Columnists.

MAY 31—London estimates that 75 per cent of the B.E.F. has been safely evacuated from Flanders.
—In a special message to Congress President Roosevelt warns that the war may spread to all continents, asks for an additional billion dollars to supplement defense appropriations and requests special legislation empowering him to call on the National Guard for active service.
—Premier Mussolini is said to be so busy preparing for eventualities that he is unable to receive U.S. Ambassador Phillips, who has another message from President Roosevelt.
—Widespread Nazi penetration in South America is indicated following an investigation by the Uruguayan government which indicates 3,000 Germans are in that small South American nation, all highly organized. The U.S.S. *Quincy*, carrying two planes, speeds toward the east coast of South America on a "good-will tour."
—The liner *President Roosevelt* arrives at Galway, Ireland, to bring home more than 900 Americans from the British Isles.

JUNE 1—German bombers strike at Southern France and squadrons of planes sweep over the Rhine north of Switzerland and attack industrial centers in the Rhone Valley. Two bombs fall in Marseille. Five towns around Lyon are struck, as is Nimes, northwest of Marseille.
—Berlin predicts a drive to the heart of France and claims that resistance around Lille has been broken.
—Grigore Gafencu, pro-Allied Foreign Minister of Rumania, is replaced by Lon Gigurtu, a close friend of Germany.

JUNE 2—Nazi bombers continue their raids down the Rhone Valley to the Mediterranean which, Paris is convinced, are intended to show Premier Mussolini that Germany will be able to support any ventures Il Duce might make across the French frontier.
—Still poised for a plunge into the war, Italy is told by Foreign Minister Ciano, in a broadcast to Italian troops: "Italy must enter the conflict to keep abreast of the changing times."
—Premier Refik Saydam warns the Turks they must be prepared to take up arms to protect their country as Italian intervention is expected.

JUNE 3—Paris and its suburbs are raided by about two hundred planes which drop more than one thousand explosive and incendiary bombs. Ambassador Bullitt narrowly escapes as a bomb lodges in the ceiling of the Air Ministry, where he is a guest at lunch.
—The Italian government postpones its World's Fair of 1942.

—Egypt rushes defensive preparations, including a drive on Fifth Column suspects.
—Berlin announces that the Nazis have "reliable information" that British agents are seeking to bring about incidents in Central America to arouse anti-German sentiment in the U.S.

JUNE 4—Referring to the Flanders operations as a "colossal military disaster," Prime Minister Churchill warns the British Commons and people that Germany's heaviest blows are yet to come. Bluntly acknowledging the loss of much material and estimating British dead, wounded and missing at 30,000 men, Mr. Churchill vows that the British fleet will never surrender and pledges the nation to fight on "alone, if necessary."
—In swift reprisal for the German raid on Paris the Allies bomb Munich, the Ruhr and Frankfort.
—A short-wave radio broadcast, heard in London, reports a large-scale demonstration in Barcelona by Spanish students shouting "Gibraltar is Spanish."

JUNE 5—In an order of the day from Field Headquarters Adolf Hitler thanks his soldiers for winning "the greatest battle in the world's history" and announces: "Now the Western Front goes back into action."
—At dawn, on a 120-mile front from the Channel coast to Laon, the Germans launch their second major offensive in the West, with tanks, artillery, airplanes and infantry in a drive on the French capital.
—Under a ruling by Attorney General Jackson immediate sale to the Allies of large stocks of World War rifles, field guns and ammunition is permitted.
—Documents, maps and photographs found on Nazi agents in Uruguay point to a Nazi plan to invade that country.

JUNE 6—The Germans hurl at least two thousand tanks into the battle in France, described by one correspondent as an "immense hell."
—Writing in the *Giornale d'Italia*, Signor Virginio Gayda of Italy warns the U.S. to stay out of the war if it does not wish to see Europeans invade the Americas.
—Premier Reynaud drops Edouard Daladier, former Premier, from his Cabinet.
—Because of the critical international situation the State Department orders all aliens, including Canadians and Mexicans, visiting the U.S. to have passports and visas after July 1.

JUNE 7—On order of General Maxime Weygand the long Allied front lines back away from murderous German attacks all along the Somme front. In a communique written in his own hand, the General makes it plain that this withdrawal is to meet the characteristic double-flanking movement of the German offensive.
—Charles Edison, Secretary of the Navy, announces the dispatch of the heavy cruiser *Wichita* to Rio de Janeiro, presumably to provide moral support to

South American countries combating Fifth Column activities.

JUNE 8—In a losing fight with the greatest mechanized onslaught in military history, the French fall back along a 60-mile front. South of the Somme the Germans throw 1,000,000 men and 8,500 tanks into the attack.
—Mussolini revamps his High Command, placing the seventy-four year old Marshal Emilio de Bono at the head of Italy's southern armies.

JUNE 9—The Norwegian government of King Haakon announces the collapse of Allied resistance to the Nazi invasion of Norway. King Haakon and his government are reported to be leaving the country to join the Allies.
—Berlin claims the sinking of the British aircraft carrier *Glorious* in a naval action off Narvik.
—In the fifth day of the Battle of France German armored columns reach Rouen and Gisors, 35 miles northwest of Paris. Civilians flee Paris.
—The U.S. liner *President Roosevelt*, sent to Ireland to pick up American refugees from Europe, arrives in New York with 723 passengers.
—The British government orders evacuation of 120,000 children from the London area, beginning June 13.

JUNE 10—From a balcony at the Palazzo Venezia, Rome, before a wildly cheering crowd of 100,000 men and women, Premier Mussolini declares war on Great Britain and France, to take effect

at one minute past midnight. Denouncing these two countries as "plutocratic and reactionary democracies of the West," Il Duce promises Turkey, Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Greece and Egypt that they will not be molested unless they attack Italy or Italian possessions.
—As a result of Italy's entry into the war Turkey speeds up mobilization.
—President Roosevelt, in a broadcast address, terms Italy's action a threat to the American way of life. "The hand that held the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor," he says. Declaring that "all our sympathies lie with those nations that are giving their life blood in combat against the gods of force and hate" the President pledges full material aid to the Allied cause.
—The sixth day of the Battle of France brings an admission from a French military spokesman that the situation is extremely serious. From the English Channel to Switzerland the Allied armies fight desperately against massed enemy formations, but the German encircling movement begins to close in on the Paris region. The French government leaves Paris for Tours. Britain throws all available forces into the battle. British naval guns, in an effort to support Allied troops near the coast, pound the Germans.

JUNE 11—French defenses along the Marne break under fierce German tank assaults. On the western part of the front the French fight bitterly to throw back German forces seeking to span the Seine with pontoons.
—Paris streets are barricaded in anticipation of house-to-house fighting.
—The Italians raid the British naval base at Malta in the first act of belligerency.
—The British Air Force launches its war against Italy by bombing air fields in the Italian colonies of Libya and Eritrea in Northern and Eastern Africa.
—In a speech apparently defending Europe's dictatorships, President Getulio Vargas of Brazil declares that "vigorous peoples fit for life must follow the route of their aspirations."

JUNE 12—Germans report their vanguard within 12½ miles of Paris.
—From its new quarters at Tours the French government admits that the Germans have reached the "outworks of Paris." The Supreme War Council, meeting "somewhere in France" is attended by Prime Minister Churchill, Prime Minister Reynaud, Vice Premier Marshal Henri Petain, War Secretary Anthony Eden, and Sir John Dill. Decisions "of the greatest importance" are taken.
—In response to President Roosevelt's order for "full speed ahead" in aid to the Allies the War Department releases eighty army bombers to the Allies.
—The Navy Department sets a record for speed in re-arming by completing contracts for twenty-two new warships only one hour after President Roosevelt signs the $1,308,171,000 Naval Appropriations Bill.
—The Egyptian Chamber of Deputies severs diplomatic relations with Italy.

JUNE 13—With the Germans closing in on three sides, the French High Command sends word to Germany through Ambassador Bullitt that Paris is an open city and will not be defended.
—The British Government rushes men and weapons to the Seine River line in France, and pledges "the utmost aid" to her ally.
—Premier Reynaud broadcasts a final desperate appeal to the U.S. to send "clouds of war planes to crush the evil force that dominates Europe."
—The German High Command reports the capture of Chalons-sur-Marne, threatening the Maginot line from the rear.
—While the step is described by semi-official circles as a trick to balk further inquiry the German Legation in Montevideo announces the disbanding of the Nazi party in Uruguay.

JUNE 14—Victorious German troops enter Paris. Battle-scarred tanks, motorized divisions, and infantry stream down the Champs Elysees, while other German armies press on South, threatening Verdun and the Maginot line. On the coast, the port of Havre is captured.
—The French Government abandons Tours and moves on southward in the direction of Bordeaux.
—The British Government decides to fight on even if the French capitulate.
—Moroccan troops occupy Tangier. Madrid claims the action was taken "to guarantee the neutrality of the international zone" in Morocco and has the approval of Great Britain, France and Italy.
—Rome reports the first activity on the Italo-French frontier, and air-attacks in Africa both by Italian and Allied bombers.

JUNE 15—The French High Command admits deep German penetration into central France, one German spearhead reaching Chaumont on the Marne.
—The flag of the Third Reich is raised over the Palace of Versailles.
—Under furious bombardment from guns of the Maginot line Nazis cross the Rhine into Alsace.
—Lithuania bows to a Soviet ultimatum. Red Army troops occupy key cities.
—In a cabled message to Premier Reynaud President Roosevelt pledges all possible moral and material help but warns that this does not imply military commitments.
—Rome reports two thrusts into France, one north of Nice, the other into Savoy, and also claims destruction of a "large destroyer" in the Gulf of Genoa.
—In a radio address Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh advocates a powerful system of national defense and non-intervention in the European war.

JUNE 16—Following long debate on decisions affecting the fate of France, Premier Paul Reynaud's government falls. The 84-year-old Marshal Henri Philippe Petain heads a new cabinet.
—The French armies abandon the Maginot line, now almost completely encircled by the lightning German drive to the region of Gray, near the Swiss border, and by another German spearhead which crossed the Rhine.
—In three successive raids German

THE FORUM QUIZ ANSWERS

(Answers from page 49)

1. *(c)* combined mechanized divisions and bombers
2. *(b)* cancer
3. *(a)* "Something of a lounge-lizard, eh?" Studies reptiles.
4. *(a)* John Steinbeck. For *Grapes of Wrath.*
5. *(d)* mercury
6. *(d)* nervous maladjustment
7. *(c)* agents whose work is to corrupt, and pave the way for invaders
8. *(b)* it plays routine, standardized arrangements. Lacks individuality.
9. *(a)* cartography. Map-making.
10. *(b)* Machiavelli. Military and political writer.
11. *(c)* Robert H. Jackson is new Attorney-General.
12. *(b)* sitskrieg
13. *(b)* printing press anniversary celebrated this year
14. *(b)* St. Cyr
15. *(b)* Archibald MacLeish. Formerly an editor of *Fortune.*
16. *(c)* Mickey Rooney. Notice we said "box office attraction," not the best actor.
17. *(c)* 300, made with 12 successive "strikes."
18. *(c)* Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
19. *(a)* The U. S. Fleet is usually in Atlantic. False. Usually the Pacific.
20. *(a)* polar bears
21. *(c)* quadrupled. So, take it easy.
22. *(a)* sarsaparilla roots
23. *(b)* leave the clutch in and apply the brakes carefully
24. either *(b)* a boor, or *(c)* a cad is correct, although the latter word usually implies word laxity
25. *(b)* winter sports such as skiing or skating
26. *(a)* the tiger. The early records of the Roman arena show this. Also more recent observations.
27. *(a)* helped bring maize, or corn, to its high stage of development. Spread it over U. S. too.
28. *(b)* wheat
29. *(c)* Admiral Perry, after battle of Lake Erie
30. *(c)* "how strait"
31. *(a)* is at a new low
32. *(b)* $45,000,000,000
33. *(a)* Big Eye telescope
34. *(c)* an anchorite
35. *(c)* German
36. *(a)* status is pronounced STAY-tus. *New York Daily News* has largest circulation in American newspaper world. Harpo Marx says nothing. Pizzicato means plucking the strings.
37. *(c)* Harold J. Laski writes good murder yarns. False. A political writer.
38. *(d)* car registration. Hot water bottle may help on those chilly northern nights.
39. *(b)* Joe Breen
40. *(a)* Wordsworth

(CHRONOLOGY—*Continued*)

planes bomb the city of Tours.
—After an emergency meeting of the Cabinet, London hears that Great Britain will carry on alone.
—Rome claims the destruction of 40 French planes.
—The British Admiralty reports the sinking of four Italian submarines.
—The Russian Army invades Latvia and Esthonia.

JUNE 17—Marshal Petain, new Premier of France, admits that France is no longer militarily capable of carrying on the war with Germany, and asks for "an honorable peace."
—Chancellor Hitler and Premier Mussolini speed to Munich to discuss the terms of France's surrender.
—Madrid hears Hitler has invited General Franco to join peace negotiations.
—In a radio address Churchill pledges the British Empire to "fight on unconquerable, until the curse of Hitler is lifted from the brows of men."
—President Roosevelt plans an economic union of the two American continents under a $2,000,000,000 Inter-American Export Corporation.

JUNE 18—The Rome-Berlin Axis partners meet at the Fuehrer House, Munich, to decide the peace terms.
—Prime Minister Churchill pledges Great Britain's determination to fight on, and appeals to the French to help.
—Information from Madrid indicates that the French Fleet and Air Force may have slipped from the Axis powers.
—Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of naval operations, recommends a $4,000,000,000 naval expansion bill designed to give the U.S. a 2-ocean navy.

JUNE 19—France is reported rejecting harsh terms and reports say the French government may go to Algiers.
—The United States government warns the Axis powers to keep their hands off the Western Hemisphere.

JUNE 20—England is again raided by German planes. The RAF bomb Northwest Germany, parts of captured France and the Netherlands.
—Reports reach the Swiss border that French planes and troops from North Africa are crossing the Mediterranean to help check the German drive in southeastern France.

Attention Librarians

•

Below is the schedule by which your unexpired subscription to FORUM *has been extended. The old* FORUM *expiration-month is in the left-hand column; the new expiration-month for* CURRENT HISTORY *and* FORUM *is in the right-hand column.*

July 1940	August
August	Sept.
Sept.	Oct.
Oct.	Nov.
Nov.	January 1941
Dec.	Feb.
January 1941	March
Feb.	May
March	June
April	July
May	Sept.
June	Oct.
July	Nov.
August	January 1942
Sept.	Feb.
Oct.	March
Nov.	May
Dec.	June

If your library had subscribed to *both* FORUM and CURRENT HISTORY, you can obtain the new, extended expiration-month for CURRENT HISTORY and FORUM by adding to the above, right-hand (FORUM extension) month, the number of months until your CURRENT HISTORY subscription would have expired. *All* duplicated subscriptions have been extended in this way.

•

CURRENT HISTORY *and* FORUM

366 Madison Ave. New York City

Printed in the U.S.A.

America's TOP BEST-SELLER*
FREE!
*LEADS ALL NON-FICTION
"From How to Read a Book I have actually learned how to read a book."
CLIFTON FADIMAN, The New Yorker
EVERY DAY A THOUSAND PEOPLE GLADLY PAY $2.50 FOR THIS AMAZING VOLUME
How to Read a Book
See Other Side of This Cover
HERE is the book that all America is talking about; the book it is buying and taking home from bookstores about as fast as the presses can turn out new copies. May we lay a copy of this stimulating new book into your lap free of all cost?
Who would have thought that America would go mad over a book about how to read a book! Some people said it was "an insult"—of course they knew how to read a book; what was this business of trying to make reading appear difficult, just in order to unravel the difficulty? They bought the book to see. Then you could almost hear "Hmms" and "Ahs" and "Ohs" as the light began to dawn. They discovered that, while they had read millions of words in books, they had actually read very few books—because they hadn't known how. Now for the first time in their lives they were learning how!
THE KEY TO A LIBERAL EDUCATION
Words are but doors (to the uninitiated in Mortimer J. Adler's method) doors that forever block the way to the world's hidden founts of knowledge. These "word-doors" must be unlocked and swung wide if you really are to read, and understand, the world's great original thinkers from Homer and Virgil to Shakespeare, Goethe, Dickens, Dostoievsky and Marx. Dr. Adler gives you the practical rules for good reading, and the total of these rules is the key to a liberal education.
Then Dr. Adler lists his pick of the great books of all time. Read more of these books and read them as Dr. Adler shows you how, Continued on other side of this cover
FOR FULL DETAILS OF THE LIMITED TIME OFFER THAT BRINGS YOU A COPY OF THIS SENSATIONAL BEST-SELLER FREE, SEE OTHER SIDE OF THIS COVER

Gold Star Mother Speaks 25¢

CURRENT HISTORY

The Voice with a Smile

"We hold," says a well-known writer, "that the young ladies of the American long distance telephone wires make up what is probably the most efficient public service crew in the world. They have profound patience and that capacity for taking pains that some one once said is all that genius amounts to.

"We once called a fellow at a hotel in Philadelphia but he had just departed on an automobile trip in a westerly direction. A few days later the long distance operator caught up with him in a little town in Missouri and he was the most surprised man in all but one of the States of the Union. The exception was New York. We were the most surprised there. To this day we have no idea how the operator did it."

DAMON RUNYON
in the *New York Mirror*

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

The Bell System cordially invites you to visit its exhibits at the New York World's Fair and the Golden Gate International Exposition, San Francisco.

The World Today in Books

NORMAN COUSINS

EDMOND TAYLOR'S *The Strategy of Terror* (Houghton Mifflin, $2.50) might have created little stir if it had been published six months. ago. Americans then were skeptical and cynical toward a war which all winter had been an Alphonse and Gaston act. Many called it the "Bore War"; talk about mass blood-letting and universal slaughter seemed a foolish over-exercise of thc imagination.

But that was before Americans were shocked out of their apathy by the gripping realization that the war had begun in earnest and that millions of people were facing certain murder. That was before fingers of steel stretched over Europe, crushing and compressing the Continent into the shape of a huge swastika; before this country sudenly discovered that the war was moving this way whether we willed it or not and that we were not yet ready to meet it; before we had a strong taste of what terror could mean and what it could do. Up to then, our confidence and indifference led to smugness and even scorn. But when the shooting started and continued to grow louder and come closer, all that collapsed, leading in many cases to the opposite extreme of fear, confusion and even intimidation. We had become participants, and in some instances victims, of what Edmond Taylor calls the battlefront of the mind.

Not that our sympathies hadn't been engaged at the very start of the war. But it remained for the sudden, stunning action of armies on the march to galvanize them into action on the psychological front. We know now the impact upon the nerves of day-after-day sitting on edge, receiving the trip-hammer blows of news telling of defeat upon defeat, each more disastrous than the last. Already this psychological warfare has claimed its victims, preparing the ground for defeatism. Some have given up the battle because they couldn't stand the pace or had found the going too tough; others have been terror-stricken by what they feel to be the irrepressible, surging Nazi tide; others have confused Nazi might with right, playing it safe and climbing aboard the *bundwagon.* The strategy of terror has begun to find its mark.

Thus a book whose title only a few months ago might have seemed puzzling or prosaic becomes strikingly real and meaningful today. Mr. Taylor's language is easily understood after the long lesson we have had in the vocabulary of the war of nerves. And severe as this instruction has been for us, we can readily appreciate how much more severe it has been and is for those peoples whose emotions are being attacked at point blank range. We feel only the echo; they the full force of the blast. Taylor, an American correspondent who was close to the dynamite through it all, has written this book to explain the importance of the weapons used against the mind in making the explosion possible. In so doing, he provides the best definition we have yet seen of the term "total war."

Propagandists of the democratic countries, he says, still seem to regard propaganda as an independent, autonomous agency. As used by Germany, however, propaganda is but one of many weapons of the new warfare. "They coordinate their attacks with military or political attacks in the way a good general coordinates all the arms in his command to attain precise objectives."

Mr. Taylor demonstrates that an important part of this aspect of warfare is the moral terrorism let loose as the vanguard of direct military action. This terrorism, which proved so effective during and after the Munich crisis, has been enlarged and exploited by Germany as an integral part of every crisis or battle ever since.

Hitler himself, according to Hermann Rauschning in *The Voice of Destruction,* has said that "the place of artillery preparation for frontal attack by the infantry in trench warfare will in future be taken by revolutionary propaganda, to break down the enemy psychologically before the armies begin to function at all. The enemy people must be demoralized and ready to capitulate, driven to moral passivity ... How to achieve the moral break-down of the enemy; that is the problem that interests me. Mental confusion, contradiction of feelings, indecisiveness, panic: these are our weapons."

The Strategy of Terror is almost like a sequel to *The Voice of Destruction.* It is the record of many predictions become realities. But it is also the record of failure of nations to take warning from events and trends, if not predictions. The evidence was there for all to see, so plain it seemed too simple to be true; but it was never really taken to heart. And when the attack came, it found those nations soft, crumbly, unprepared. The final collapse was as much from within as from without.

Taylor reports that one of the most effective forms of Nazi nerve-tactics was the use of "dissolvent propaganda," which loosened and destroyed social cohesion and morale. This was particularly true in France, he writes [his book was off the presses before the capitulation of France], where the people were subjected to a constant barrage of propaganda seeking to undermine confidence in those in authority, and where social groups were torn apart and then rebuilt by better-organized forces sympathetic to the enemy. Anti-Semitism was provoked, not so much because of a desire to destroy a race, but because it was an issue which could make Gentiles fight among themselves and thereby enable the Nazis to attempt to widen the breach and destroy the

"MY BEER IS THE DRY BEER!"
says
BILL TILDEN
Greatest Tennis Champion of all Time
A Quicker Quencher
... because it's NOT SWEET
The beer for beer-lovers
... because it's LIGHT
Ideal companion at mealtime
... because it's DRY
Thank you Bill Tilden. More than one hundred years ago, before lawn tennis made its bow, we were brewing fine beer. Today, one champion acclaims another when Bill Tilden hails Rheingold Extra Dry. This fine beer is on hand
at an increasing number of new places this
There must be one near you.

Rheingold
EXTRA DRY
Lager Beer - Not Sweet
BREWED BY Liebmann Breweries,
BREWERS FOR OVER 100 YEARS EST. 1837 - IN NEW YORK 1855

Rheingold Extra Dry Lager Beer is on sale in bottles, cans and on tap at all good taverns and package stores throughout the East. Copr 1940, Liebmann Breweries, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.

unity of a country. Underlying it all was the effort to unnerve the individual, to frighten or intimidate him into inaction or acquiescence: "propaganda, showmanship and diplomacy built up the suspense, created the alarms, and delivered the shocks."

Taylor is not merely using abstract theories. He lived through it all and can talk in the specific, citing case after case. Incorporated in the book are excerpts from diaries—his own and his wife's — restoring the supercharged atmosphere of the days when the war of nerves served as Mr. Hitler's heavy artillery for the war of steel to come. The feeling, he says, of uneasy living under the Damoclean sword was felt by every man and woman in Europe. "Like a guilty secret it lay between us and our sleep, our enjoyment of the present and our hope of the future. The slightest stir troubled it and clouded all our thoughts." Nor did the outbreak of the war relieve the tension; it only served to substitute one set of anxieties for another; the fear of impending war gave way to a fear of impending death. This fear was played upon, magnified, exploited by German propagandists, who used not only the strategy of terror but the reality of fifth column forces to bring that terror closer to home.

The question to be asked, of course, is why the Allied powers did not similarly attempt such tactics. The answer is that they have, but their efforts were separate from their other war activities, and lacked coordination, virility, dynamism. Moreover, they were unable to follow through. They were tied down from the start to a war of defense which prevented them from giving their psychological maneuvers the weight of the threat of terror from attack. Germany, on the other hand, was able to follow up her nerve artillery with a show of steel.

Taylor does not pull punches. In Paris he was able to observe the work of Germany's Fifth Column, which included not only pro-German but pro-Russian elements. He tells of letters sent to French soldiers at the front, giving false news about their families. "Often there was no obvious

CURRENT HISTORY

and FORUM

August, 1940

Contents

WAR AND DEFENSE

Britain's Fleet Our Shield . . *Commander Melvin F. Talbot* 20
This Is Our Strength . . . . *Vernon Bartlett* 23
Mobilizing U.S. Man Power . . . . . *Robert Strausz-Hupe* 32
Machine Tools for Defense . . . . *Clifford S. Stilwell* 37
Japan's New Premier . . . . *Mark Gayn* 40
A Mother's Plea . . . . *Dorothy Dunbar Bromley* 48

GENERAL ARTICLES

1940's Candidates . . . . *Lindsay Rogers* 16
Let's Listen to Swing . . . . *Earl Sparling* 25
The Dark Messiah . . . . *Thomas Wolfe* 29
Capitalist's Cooperative . . . . *Sidney M. Shalett* 44

THE WORLD TODAY IN BOOKS . . . . *Norman Cousins* 1
THE BOOK FORUM . . . . *Eleanor Van Alen* 4
BYLINES 7
LETTERS 8
HISTORY IN THE MAKING 10
FORUM QUIZ . . . . Compiled by *Fredrik DeCoste* 50
THEY SAY 51
CHRONOLOGY 58
Index to Volume 51 63

COVER PHOTO BY ACME

• • •

Current History and Forum. Vol. LI. No 12. August, 1940 Whole No. 306 Current History combined with The Forum and The Century Magazine May 23, 1940 Current History and Forum published monthly by C-H Publishing Corporation. Publication office, 29 Worthington Street, Springfield, Mass.; New York office, 366 Madison Ave, New York, N. Y. E. Trevor Hill, President, John T Hackett, Vice-President, Roger W. Straus, Jr., Secretary; Edward F. Healey, Treasurer; Edward F. Healey, Advertising Manager. 25c a copy; $3 a year; in the United States, possessions, Central and South America and Spain: Canada 50c a year additional; elsewhere $1.25 a year additional Subscribers should send change of address three weeks in advance Indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature Unless accompanied by postage, unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned Entered as second class matter April 18, 1939, at the postoffice at Springfield, Mass., under the act of March 3, 1879. Entered in Canada as second-class matter. Printed in U S. A.

MEMORANDUM FOR LIBRARIANS:

CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM indexes are published in the last number of each volume.

Beginning with the present volume, 51, every volume will have twelve numbers and will run from September through August. The complete index for the volume is in this issue.

Important notice on page 84.

political propaganda at all in these fiendish letters. The object was merely to shake the soldier's nerves, make him hate the war."

Taylor found this one of a number of tricks employed by Communists. Another strategem. mentioned in a number of other reports, was the use of professional weepers who traveled around in public conveyances wearing deep mourning and giving an "exaggerated exhibition of seemingly uncontrollable grief for the purpose of depressing public morale." By his alliance with Stalin, says Taylor, Hitler was able not only to avoid fighting a major war on two fronts, but to obtain a ready-made fifth column in France and England.

The emotional conflict now observable all over the world, Taylor believes, is partly the result of fundamental, real cleavages, but it is just as much the result of the war of nerves, the "previous abuses of propaganda, the dissolvent tactics which aim at destroying social morale by every means, and the ideological collapse. Political ideals are dangerous weapons, and they have been used recklessly by statesmen all over the world, most recklessly and most criminally by two mystic atheists, Hitler and Stalin."

It is a compliment to Mr. Taylor, unlike so many other writers on world affairs today, he does not attempt to present you with a sure-fire solution to the problems which emerge from his book. Too often are we disposed to suspend all mental operations and relieve ourselves of the necessity of any action as soon as some one conveniently comes forward with a comfortable way out. What Mr. Taylor does is to tell you about the experience of other peoples and their inability first to understand what they were up against and secondly to meet the challenge when it came. Whether we profit from that experience is largely a test of our own intelligence.

The Book Forum

Edited by

ELEANOR VAN ALEN

VOYAGES TO THE EAST

As a third set of locks are made for the Panama Canal, as fighting continues in China, as Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies are threatened, Hendrik Willem van Loon again gives us the geography behind the news in his *Story of the Pacific* (Harcourt, Brace & Co., $3.00). It is one of his best rambling histories. That is saying a great deal.

Meanwhile, the Far East comes in for altogether different treatment in Osbert Sitwell's poetic *Escape with Me.* With Maugham's *The Gentleman in the Parlor,* and Ackerly's *Hindoo Holiday,* Sitwell's *Escape with Me* is one of the best travel books of the past two decades.

Each writer is in his element. Mr. Van Loon's genius for endearing digression finds ample play in the lonely yet islanded expanses of the Pacific, and amidst the fantastic tall tales of its explorers and navigators. The Sitwell name is an international byword for taste and connoisseurship. His elaborate and imagistic style is admirably suited to describe fabulous Angkor Thom, jungle capital of the Khmer Empire in Indo-China, or diversified, polyglot Peking.

To this reviewer, who visited at length the Angkor ruins in Indo-China eleven years ago (and since then much has been uncovered), Osbert Sitwell recalls marvelously those royal edifices which he says are "far more grandiose than anything built in the heyday of Greek or Roman art." Apparently the latest theory about this civilization, which endured only six centuries and perished so mysteriously, is not of plague or invasion, but of slave rebellion, which wiped out all its rulers, leaving only sixty square miles of ruins centering around Angkor. Roman-

tically, the elusive wings of kingfishers—sold at a high premium in the Chinese market for the manufacture of fancy headdresses through the 13th century—paid for the lavish and dissolute Khmer structure of living.

When Mr. Sitwell turns to Peking, there is nothing startlingly new in his essays on Chinese cookery or gardens except that they, too, are colored by his intense individualism. Escapist for all that he is, he is not blind to the subhuman level of existence of the poorer Chinese despite their picturesqueness. Analyzing the national character, he agrees with the other numerous observers who believe the Chinese will always assimilate their conquerors.

Mr. Van Loon is much more interested in speculations regarding empires and peoples than in poeticizing places. A leisurely Pacific cruise evidently gave birth to this "story." His inimitable journalese, and his attractive scrawly drawings, are well suited to the task he here sets himself. Opening with musings on the Panama Canal, he goes on to consider the far-flung Spanish Empire, and how Spain was able to maintain her position, and for such a long period, "in spite of her completely preposterous approach toward all colonial problems." Could it have been the "formality of its life," as today we cite British pageantry as solidifying the British Empire—or did cite it till recently!

Mr. Van Loon delights in recounting tales of the sixteenth century sea battles between the Spanish dreadnaughts and the "fighty English or Dutch pirates." He finds a "touch of Homeric greatness" in some of these encounters, fought out some six to twelve thousand miles from home.

Perhaps the most captivating chapters in his book deal with the "prehistoric Pacific" and its peoples: and the supreme maritime achievement of all time, their crossing of the vast ocean in open boats, "in quest of an ancestral Paradise." Mr. Van Loon indulges in some very interesting guesswork about the Polynesians, their powers of celestial navigation on this venture. Somehow without ever entangling the reader, the author skips rapidly about in time and location. Now he tells of the second discovery of the Pacific, or of the South Sea Bubble; now he gives the biography in brief of some doughty navigator—till he writes finis to it all with the one who emerges clearly his hero, Captain James Cook, the man to discover Australia, and "one of the most humane men that ever set foot on a quarterdeck."

Van Loon is a political moralist as well as an amusing chronicler. He pleads for realism in international relations and has a profound contempt for most missionary work. He enjoys debunking modern equivalent of ancient abuses like trade restriction and monopoly to prove how little man benefits from experience. Though the book is slangy in spots, its use of our idiom to nail home points is for the most part a joy.

E. V. A.

IMPERIAL STALINISM

Henry C. Wolfe, recent author of *The German Octopus*, and now of *The Imperial Soviets* (Doubleday Doran, $2.50), descries no sign of a fusion of two revolutions in the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939. Rather he sees in Stalin the supreme opportunist. As long as the world revolution can best be served by cooperation with Hitler, Stalin will work with the Reich against Britain. But his fundamental policy does not vary; it amounts to playing his enemies off against each other. Stalin's dream, Mr. Wolfe declares, is of an exhausted and suicidal Europe which would yield to the imperialistic aims of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Wolfe refers to the part played by the Germans in 1917 in "bolshevising the young Russian regime that was struggling to establish the forms of democracy." Since then, he demonstrates, the Reich, through its agents, has kept itself well informed about the Russian Bear. He traces concisely Russo-German relations from the first World War when "the Germans," he says, "saw in the Russians, under the right kind of leadership, the best troops in the world." It was the Junker class and the industrialists who wanted this connection with Russia, "seeing in the enormous power of the Soviet Union an instrument of revenge." The rapprochement was furthered by the Nietzschean philosophy of the German reactionaries who nevertheless, ironically enough, feared encroaching Communism. In the Russian leaders' minds, a pact with Germany became simply a matter of a good deal, confronted as they were by a hostile Europe. Meantime, "the entente between the German and Red army never died."

Mr. Wolfe analyzes Soviet economy, education, and propaganda with shrewdness and detachment. Though he finds the U.S.S.R. no Utopia, he gives it full marks for its realistic foreign policy in a world of wishful thinkers. Here is a lucid guide for the busy layman or student trying to keep pace with power politics today.

E. V. A.

TAKING OUR PULSE

A Review by Robert Offergeld

The public opinion poll has come of age. In *The Pulse of Democracy* (Simon & Schuster, $2.50) George Gallup and Saul F. Rae render an accounting of a formidable new weapon for popular government. Today the scientific poll of public opinion, the type of poll conducted by Mr. Gallup, faithfully publishes the "sense of the people." It protects their legislators by deflating the claims of pressure groups and demagogues. Ultimately it educates the electorate by confronting it, from week to week, with the critical issues of the day.

Significantly, this good news comes not from agitated political quarters, but from a free and skilled profession of social scientists. *The Pulse of Democracy* is a monument of patient and scrupulous fact finding. But it also is a stirring declaration of faith. It frankly embraces the classic demo-

cratic problem: to measure public opinion without warping it. No dictator—whose real problem, after all, is to warp public opinion without permitting it to be measured—could sponsor a Gallup poll or a *Fortune* survey. A courageous German comedian told his audience that, wherever he went, he seemed to meet "that 2 per cent" who voted against Hitler. We may assume that he is now revising his percentages in a concentration camp.

The technical framework of a Gallup poll is controlled to an incredible degree. The old method of taking "gigantic samples" at random is gone. So accurate are the present controls that indefinite multiplication of "minimum samples" usually affects the result less than one per cent. The field workers are skilled interviewers, and their objectives are specific major groups within the total population. These major groups are analyzed according to geographic district, urban-rural balance, economic status, age and sex. The questions used are elaborately pre-tested. "Colored" and "weighted" words are eliminated. Even the personal views of the field workers are known and accounted. These precautions, and a host more, guard the most sensitive instrument yet devised for the measurement of public opinion.

Fifty years ago, James Bryce voiced the urgent need of democracy for just such an instrument. Elections are inadequate: opinion, for one thing, is continuous, while elections are not. Rival candidates more often obscure the issue than represent it. Continuous, neutral, responsible only to the public confidence, the public opinion poll is an historic blow to demagogy.

By way of climax, *The Pulse of Democracy* has an electrifying appendix. It is a selection of representative polls—but it is much more. It is the great Yea and Nay of the American people, their plain will on the vital issues of the last four years. Thomas Jefferson affirmed that, when the affairs of the nation went too far amiss, the "good sense of the people" would intervene to set them right. That it is quite capable of doing so, no one who studies this appendix can doubt.

bylines

MARK GAYN was born in Barim, Outer Mongolia, where he lived for 14 years. He went to Shanghai in 1926 and worked on a Chinese-owned English-language newspaper until the editor was assassinated by jealous rivals. He traveled for many years in Japan, China and Russia where he served as special correspondent for *The Washington Post*, and other American papers. He was also an editorial writer for *The China Weekly Review* in Shanghai.

VERNON BARTLETT, journalist, founder and editor of the English magazine, *The World Review*, is an independent progressive member of Parliament. He was London Director of the League of Nations from 1932-1933.

ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE, author, lecturer, is an Associate Editor of CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM.

EARL SPARLING is a radio script writer, newspaperman, and magazine writer. He has also written four books on financial and economic subjects.

COMMANDER MELVIN F. TALBOT is a lecturer on naval history at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis.

SIDNEY M. SHALETT is a reporter for *The New York Times*. He was formerly employed by *The Chattanooga Times* and has contributed magazine articles to several publications.

THOMAS WOLFE, who died at the age of 38, has won critical acclaim as one of America's most prominent writers. The MS from which "Black Messiah" is taken will be published posthumously in the fall under the title *You Can't Go Home Again.*

CLIFFORD S. STILWELL is the vice-president of the National Machine Tool Builder's Association.

DOROTHY DUNBAR BROMLEY, author, is a feature writer and columnist for *The New York Post.*

LINDSAY ROGERS has been Professor of Public Law at Columbia University since 1929 and associate editor of *The American Political Science Quarterly* since 1921. He has been a newspaper reporter and has written half a dozen books.

To the Editors:

As a member of the New York State Senate Committee on Public Health, I am delighted with the information about anesthetics in the article by Marguerite Clark in your July issue. This article will make the prospect of an operation less terrifying for all of us.

Hearty congratulations also on the evident success of the combination of CURRENT HISTORY & FORUM! You have kept the best features of both and one result is that I want to be kept on as a subscriber.

THOMAS C. DESMOND,
Chairman, Committee on Affairs of Cities.
NEWBURGH, N. Y.

To the Editors:

I have read with great interest the excellent article by Marguerite Clark. "This Won't Hurt Much" achieves the effect of making operations actually something to look forward to. I am not at all eager to make another trip to the hospital and the operating room, but should it prove necessary, I expect to find the visit more interesting and even fascinating because I have read what Marguerite Clark has written concerning the variety and effectiveness of anesthetics.

If this article could be read by everyone in America, I'm certain doctors' offices would be flooded by thousands of people who do not dare go now for fear the doctor will insist on a painful operation.

EDWIN H. PAGET,
Director Division of Speech,
Department of English,
University of North Carolina.
RALEIGH, N. C.

To the Editors:

Marguerite Clark's article discussing the numerous types of anesthetics available when human ills commit us to surgery, reduces a complex medical subject to popular reading. It answers questions we raise at one time or other with doctors who usually reply in Latin phrases and jumbled technicalities so confusing, we are only too happy to drop the subject forthwith.

WILLIAM HAWORTH.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

To the Editors:

I have examined the July CURRENT HISTORY & FORUM and I believe the combined forces of these two famous publications will accomplish far more than either could have done singly.

The article "This Won't Hurt Much" by Marguerite Clark is a workmanlike handling of a subject too often obscured in generalities and inconclusions. Such ABC treatment of technical material has a definite place in today's press.

HUGH MCKAY,
Advertising Manager,
Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co.
JERSEY CITY, N. J.

To the Editors:

Mr. Basil Walker's article "Arms for America" in your July issue strikes directly at the center of our rearmament needs. It seems to me to be a calm, analytical approach that contrasts pleasantly with the emotion and hysteria so prevalent today.

If we are not to plunge off the deep end in the near future, as the history of nations is measured, we must count the cost of such a program.

War is one of the few major activities of man which he is pursuing with less and less efficiency as time passes. Mechanized equipment and automatic rifles are very effective in their function of maiming and killing, but they cost more and more per casualty with each succeeding war. Herein lies the danger, even for the victors, because the financial load placed upon present and future generations in meeting this cost may destroy any existing government. Thus we may win but to lose.

The best defense we can offer against this eventuality is a recognition of the problem confronting us followed by aggressive but carefully planned measures to meet the requirements at minimum cost.

T. M. MCNIECE.
SCARSDALE, N. Y.

To the Editors:

Last evening I spent an entertaining and informative two hours reading the first combined issues of CURRENT HISTORY & FORUM.

Congratulations on the vitality and timeliness of the authoritative, unbiased interpretation of momentous events which your first combined issue presents. Thinking Americans —realistic Americans—will, I predict, turn to you in increasing numbers for help in a better understanding of the many forces which are remaking the world and our ways of life before our very eyes.

I particularly liked Douglas Johnson's "War Imperils America" article. Every American should read it and understand how the U. S., by acting with courage now, can forestall the threat of a triumphant Germany.

L. ROHE WALTER,
Advertising Manager,
The Flintkote Co.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

To the Editors:

I have read Mr. Nathan Straus's article, "Housing Does Its Part," in the July issue of CURRENT HISTORY & FORUM. I find myself in a general agreement with him, although I could qualify certain details.

I believe that the public housing program should be continued on a moderate scale. I think, however, that Mr. Straus's statement to the effect that "the public housing program could be expanded to the point where our whole national slum problem would be solved . . . ." may be a little misleading. The apparent implication here is that the problem will ultimately be solved entirely by building subsidized housing, an implication Mr. Straus probably did not intend. As a practical matter, the slum problem must be solved in large part as a result of generally increased prosperity and also in large part by redevelopment projects initiated by private enterprise with private capital, with public housing acting as a demonstrator of need, a stimulator of local responsibility and private enterprise, and as a special provider of decent housing for families who cannot pay minimum economic rents. Under this conception, which is gaining wide acceptance, public housing becomes primarily an experimental program to stimulate orderly large-scale redevelopment of blighted property, and avoids any implication of becoming a gigantic program providing institutionalized living for armies of semi-dependent families.

I believe, with Mr. Straus, that local housing authorities and the U.S.H.A. can play an important part in meeting sudden new demands which will arise for emergency housing in new and existing centers of industrial activity stimulated by the defense program. Naturally, all existing housing facilities and all that can be produced by private enterprise should be used first. But private enterprise is financing on a 20-year amortization basis and will not, in many cases, be able to take the financial risk of producing housing that may be actually needed in the respective localities for a comparatively short period. In such cases, only government can assume the risk.

Of course, any housing produced and operated by local authorities or the U.S.H.A. for well-paid industrial workers may be expected to charge an economic rent. Local authorities operating some properties on an economic basis and some on a subsidized basis may very well come to see the advantage of charging economic rents in their public housing projects and applying subsidies in the form of rent-assistance based on family need (subsidizing families instead of subsidizing property). This, to my way of thinking, is likely to gain support for public housing from many people who have hitherto opposed it.

THOMAS S. HOLDEN,
Vice-President in charge of Statistics and Research,
F. W. Dodge Corporation.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

To the Editors:

I like Mr. Walker's article very much for its orderly presentation of facts. It is not cheerful reading, but these are times in which it is doubly foolish for us to deceive ourselves.

Articles of this sort are an excellent prophylactic against this danger.

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK,
Contributing Editor,
The Wall Street Journal.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

To the Editors:

A friend of mine in the U. S. wrote to me as follows:— "The best monthly published in the States is in my opinion CURRENT HISTORY. Send $1.50 to C. H. Publishing Corporation, 366 Madison Avenue, N. Y. C., for a trial six months' subscription and you will not be disappointed." I have followed my friend's advice.

T. FERGUSON.
SAINT LUCIA, B. W. I.

To the Editors:

I have read with real interest the article by Mr. Nathan Straus on Housing and National Defense in the July issue of CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM and I am glad to have this opportunity to comment on this splendid, courageous and straightforward statement on one of the most vital problems confronting the American people in these crucial times.

In the present world-wide crisis the permanent security of America lies in action directed towards domestic betterment. The USHA program goes straight to the heart of our most urgent economic problem. The splendid beginning made by the United States Housing Authority towards meeting the workers' need for decent homes has proved this program to be one of the most effective defense weapons of our national welfare. The defense of welfare. The USHA Low Rent Housing and Slum-Clearance program is a strategic line of defense of economic security of our people.

WILLIAM GREEN, *President*
American Federation of Labor,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

To the Editors:

Our young Americans need to feel their importance in understanding and maintaining the American way of life. The Junior Statesmen of America have a procedure that is practical and stimulates just the kind of interest needed.

ROY LYMAN WILBUR,
President, Stanford University.
CALIFORNIA

To the Editors:

Having read the July issue of your magazine, and having had a favorable impression, I write to congratulate and encourage you, as well as to make some comment. To me, it lives well up to its title . . . .

Although I can but guess as to the accuracy, fairness, and completeness of the articles that form the principal part of the magazine, their clear style, restrained and tempered conclusions, and their well qualified

(Continued on page 60)

Havana Conference

Havana's Hotel Nacional, high on a rocky ledge above the Gulf of Mexico's blue waters, catches the rays of the morning sun that put out the night lights along the Malecon. Gulf breezes temper the tropical heat. All day long palms and banana trees wave lazily on the hotel grounds. History has been made at the Hotel Nacional. Bullets marred the pastel-colored walls during the troubled days under President Machado in the last decade; shells ripped away the stucco. But all that is past. A new chapter was opened in the hotel's record toward the end of July.

From the United States came a delegation, headed by Secretary of State Hull, to take up temporary residence at the Nacional. The U.S. suite became the center of Hemisphere attention. Mr. Hull and his aides had come for an Inter-American conference more important than any other in the long series of meetings dedicated to closer relations between the Americas.

Conference Background

Pan-Americanism used to be a vague, idealistic business. At its conferences delegates from the twenty-one New World republics talked of fellowship, adopted high-sounding resolutions. Meanwhile, their governments' policies made Inter-American cooperation impossible. Then Europe's present war gave Pan-Americanism new meaning.

Latin America has felt the pressure of German diplomacy—a diplomacy designed for Nazi exploitation of Latin America's natural resources once trade routes reopen. Copper, cotton, meat, wheat, wool — all these products and more the Third Reich seeks—at its own price. So Nazi propaganda circulates in Latin America, "fifth columns" are active. The threat has been that a Germany triumphant in Europe might come to Latin America and take what it wanted.

Latin Americans have not liked the prospect. Nor has the United States. A Nazi-exploited Latin America would endanger American foreign trade. A Nazi-dominated Latin America would menace American defense. What to do about it? Part of South America is farther from New York than Europe is. South American products—notably wheat, meat and cotton—compete with U.S. products. For the U.S., defense of the whole Hemisphere would be a stupendous task.

Plans and Prospects

These riddles lay behind the calling of the Havana conference. Some way out had to be found. A great foreign trade monopoly for the entire Hemisphere had been suggested by the United States. South Americans were lukewarm, and German pressure was exerted against the plan. But that plan, and many another plan discussed publicly or privately at the conference, would continue to be discussed elsewhere for many a month to come.

Defense against military attack was another conference issue. A corollary was the future of Old World colonies in the New World. The Monroe Doctrine forbids the transfer of such colonies from one Old World power to another. But what if a victorious Germany demanded the French West Indian Islands—Martinique and Guadeloupe—or Dutch Guiana or, if Britain should fall, Jamaica and all the other islands over which the Union Jack has waved? The American nations must find answer to these and other problems of defense, and answers will not be easy.

Stalin Stretches Out

The story goes that Stalin, "red czar" of the Soviet Union, keeps a portrait of Peter the Great in his Kremlin study. True or not, it illustrates something that does seem true—that Stalin admires Peter's work in making Russia great, that he is following a foreign policy similar to the eighteenth-century autocrat's.

Peter pushed Russia's borders to the Baltic. Peter drove southward at the expense of the Persians and Turks. Peter set Russia on the quest for a warm-water port that has dominated Russian policy to this day. Catherine the Great followed the quest. So did the nineteenth-century czars. The last of the czars, Nicholas II, thought he would reach the goal. A quarter century ago his treaties with Britain and France assured Russia—if the World War were won against the Central Powers—that she could raise her banner over Moslem Istanbul and command the historic Straits.

The Bolshevik Revolution allowed the Allies to tear up that treaty. Russia was barred from the Straits. She lost lands that had been acquired as long ago as Peter's time. Finland, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Poland—all broke away from the rule of Moscow. Rumania seized the backward border province of Bessarabia, for which Czar Alexander I, after winning the region, set the bells ringing throughout his empire.

In the past ten months Stalin has proved that these lands had not been forgotten in the Kremlin. He has regained part of Poland, thanks to the German conquest. He has won back strategic areas

in Finland. He has brought the Finnish Republic, if not under Russian domination, at least close to it. Last fall he forced Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to concede special military rights to Russia within their borders. This summer these three Baltic States have given themselves over to the rule of Russia. Military occupation came first. Then followed Russian-dominated "elections" for Communist-controlled Parliaments. The way was paved for membership in the Soviet Union and the death of a capitalism that had made these little nations—combined population roughly 6,000,000—oases of pleasant living along the Russian frontier.

Rumania Bows

Hardly had the Baltic windows been guarded before the Soviet colossus turned upon Rumania. That kingdom, a conglomerate of peoples, bowed low. To Russia with hardly a blow passed Bessarabia, grain country that supports 3,000,000 people, and part of Bukowina, a northern enclave that was Austrian before it was Rumanian. To Russia also passed special naval rights in Rumanian ports. The Soviet Union now extends to the Danube delta.

The rapid Russian expansion again raised the spectre of the "bear that walks like a man." Was the Soviet Union embarked upon the historic policy of seeking Istanbul and the Straits? The Turkish Republic feared so. Was Russian influence to become great in the Balkans, as during the days of the czars? Italy thought as much. And Germany, some suspected, was worried lest Russia stand across the path to the East, a path certain to be sought once the war in the West had come to an end. The fuel of future conflict seems at hand.

Fascist France

Henri Philippe Petain is an old man. At eighty-four, he has reached the time of life when a soldier should be left alone with his memories of battles and honors. For Petain, Marshal of France, hero of Verdun, that time of life has yet to come. A few weeks ago he became both President and Premier of France, and in that capacity began to build a new nation on the ruins of the German-defeated Third Republic.

It was a strange fate for the man who at Verdun in 1916 saved the Republic from German onslaught. A soldier in the wars for democracy was now destroying democracy, making France Fascist. Petain was born when the dictatorial empire of Napoleon III was at high noon. He saw that empire fade in the storms of the Franco-Prussian war. As a young man he grew up with the Third Republic that fought again and again for the liberty, equality and fraternity promised by the French Revolution.

When the anniversary of that revolution—Bastille Day—came around in July 1940, liberty, equality and fraternity were in the discard. The aged Marshal proclaimed the national holiday a day of mourning, but it was mourning for military defeat, not lost liberty. Already the France of Briand, of Clemenceau, of Zola and Anatole France, was gone with the wind. The French Parliament had held its last tumultuous debate; a Parliament on the Fascist model, advisory but powerless, was to be created. The power of governing the nation, nominally at least—for Germany had the real power—had been granted to Petain. As President and Premier his power, in theory, was as absolute as that of Napoleon III in Petain's days in pinafores.

How complete the break with the past would be early decrees indicated. The old provinces, abolished in the French Revolution, were to be restored. Religious orders prepared to end their generation-long exile. There was even talk of bringing back a king—one of the Bourbons who had not reigned in France since Louis Philippe fled Paris in the 1848 revolution.

Disillusionment with the regime that had brought defeat played a part in the swift turn from a democratic to a Fascist France.

German pressure helped to explain it. Responsible also were some of the leading politicians of France. Around Petain were grouped many who had long been thought Fascist in sympathy. Most prominent among them was Pierre Laval, Vice Premier in the new regime, designated political heir of the Marshal. So great was his influence that many observers saw the nominal leader of Fascist France as but a figurehead. "The voice is the voice of Petain," they said, "but the hand is the hand of Laval."

Burma Road Closed

The road that runs from Lashio in British Burma to Kinming in Chinese Yunnan threads through tropical jungles, crosses deep gorges, bridges rivers, climbs mountains. A tremendous job of construction, it is yet a poor road in the dry season, while the rains of summer often block it with landslides. But the Burma Road is the lifeline of China. Over it toil trucks, mules and oxen bearing supplies for the harassed government of Chiang Kai-shek in the western city of Chungking.

Lately the Burma Road became an issue in diplomacy. Japan wanted to close it, for if the trucks ceased to move toward China, Chiang Kai-shek would soon run short of the precious oil and munitions that are his warring nation's lifeblood. China's ports are in Japanese hands. The collapse of France made possible the closing of trade routes through French Indo-China. Only the Burma Road and the long haul from Russia remained.

Japan put pressure on Britain to close the road, and the British, temporarily, for the rainy season when traffic is limited, agreed. In the meantime, it might be possible to arrange a peace between Japan and Chiang Kai-shek. In any case, as Prime Minister Churchill told Commons, Britain was in no position to antagonize the Japanese. China protested against the closure. The United States disapproved it, saying trade routes should not be shut so arbitrarily. But the Burma Road was only one move in the game the Japanese were playing for high stakes.

Those stakes were a Japanese-

Defense Commissioner Knudsen

WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN first came to public attention before he reached 20. That was just before the turn of the century, when he startled the citizens of his native Copenhagen by turning up in the streets with a friend, madly pedalling a strange contraption—the first tandem bicycle ever seen in the city.

Knudsen, who had just finished his apprenticeship as a bicycle mechanic, had put the tandem together himself. Putting things together has been his specialty ever since.

Born, on March 25, 1879, the tenth child of once well-to-do Customs Inspector Knud Peter Knudsen, the man who now signs himself merely K was christened Signius Wilhelm Poul. Some 20 years later, an American timekeeper refused to cope with this and changed it to William S. In riveter's language, the William S. became "Bill."

Signius Wilhelm passed through the excellent public schools of Denmark with honor. At 14, he was apprenticed to a wholesale bicycle shop. He emerged a mechanic, took to tinkering with machinery, saved money and finally, early in 1900, set off to America.

Past Ellis Island, the six-foot-three, blue-eyed Dane lost little time getting a job. He was a mechanic, and he liked to work with his hands. So Knudsen became, in rapid succession, a reamer and riveter in a shipyard, repairman at a railroad roundhouse, then bench hand at the bicycle-making John R. Keim steel mills in Buffalo, N. Y. Back at his own trade, he stayed, and became superintendent in 1907.

Here, for the first time, Bill Knudsen had a real chance to show his talent for handling men and for making machines turn out goods. The bicycle business slumped soon after he took charge of the plant. But the automobile business was growing, and so the Keim mills went in for auto parts. When Henry Ford bought the plant lock, stock and barrel in 1911 Knudsen was put in charge of Ford Motor's Buffalo plant. In 1913, he moved on to Detroit.

In the next seven years, Knudsen set up no less than 27 assembly plants for Ford throughout the U.S. In 1917-18 he took a personal hand in the production of 60 submarine chasers. He became known to General Pershing as the man who delivered 2,500 newly ordered ambulances before the army was able to find enough drivers for them.

By 1921, when Knudsen left Ford, the foundation of his reputation as the outstanding production genius of the U.S. was firmly established. So firmly, that he was invited to join General Motors, first as advisor, then as Vice President of Chevrolet. It took him six years to raise the production of Chevrolet from 68,000 to 1,200,000 cars annually and, through his competition, to force his old boss, Henry Ford, to abandon the Model T. He reached the office of President of General Motors Corp.—the world's leading automobile producer—during the sit-down battles of 1937, achieving a total income of $307,000 that year.

It was this post which the soft-spoken Danish giant left on June 3 to take on, at a dollar a year, his greatest production job. In the President's Advisory Defense Commission he is to be "in full command of the industrial manufacturing of tanks, airplanes, engines, uniforms and the multifarious items needed in the program" for the defense of his adopted country.

L. C. GRAY

dominated East Asia. In it, not only would the island empire dominate most of China, but also to Japan's hegemony would fall European colonies like Hong Kong, French Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies, perhaps eventually the Philippines. The scheme was set forth in an "Asiatic Monroe Doctrine" which held Japan alone should influence the state of affairs in East Asia and the South Seas. The naming of Prince Konoye as Japanese Premier to head a government on the Fascist model was thought to be a step in this policy.

To Army men and others the moment seemed ripe for success. With France helpless, with Britain's energies occupied in the West, with the United States uncertain of its Hemisphere defenses, there was none to say "Nay."

Progress Report

Into President Roosevelt's oval office at the White House newspapermen crowded for a press conference while the Democratic National Convention was in session. The President said he had important news—more important than any news likely to come out of the convention. He had reports to release from the National Advisory Defense Commission.

For weeks the commission had been laboring in quarters in the marble temple of the Federal Reserve Board. On several fronts—raw materials, production, labor—the seven-member group had pushed ahead. Its reports disclosed that supplies of materials like rubber and tin were being assured. Obstacles to large-scale production of war machinery were being removed. Orders were being placed for tanks and planes, battleships and guns.

The contracts being let were primary steps in the largest peacetime armament program in American history. Billions for defense had become a nationally accepted necessity. A $10,000,000,000 program was under way, and the sum would grow much larger.

The U.S. Arms

Included in the U.S. rearmament program are plans for the following:

Army. By September, recruiting officers hope to raise the size of the United States Army to 375,000 men, and to mobilize several divisions of the National Guard for training. Chief of Staff Marshall declares that, to defend this hemisphere, we must eventually have an army of 2,000,000. By the spring of 1942 the Army Air Corps will be increased to a total of 26,500 planes.

Navy. A 70 per cent increase is planned in fleet tonnage—to provide a two-ocean navy—that may require anywhere from six to nine years for construction. The number of bases and shipbuilding yards will be increased. Naval plane strength will be raised to 7,000 or 8,000 planes.

To bring these plans to comple-

tion is the task not only of men in the War and Navy Departments and in the armed services, but also in the Advisory Defense Commission. The commission must see to it that machine guns and torpedoes, bomb-sights and compasses, will be available for the fighting forces. It must make sure that American industry can provide all the goods that would be needed in war time. That was why the President found the commission's reports so important. They showed that defense was getting under way.

Memphis Commercial Appeal

Don't let our mouths get bigger than our guns.

Compulsory Service

A great, silvered passenger plane roared down the runways at New York's La Guardia Field one day recently and took off for Washington. On board was Henry L. Stimson, who for the second time in his seventy-two years was becoming Secretary of War. As he entered the plane, reporters asked him if he favored the pending Burke-Wadsworth bill for compulsory military service. "I am all for it," he said.

Senator Burke, a Nebraska Democrat, and Representative Wadsworth, a New York Republican, had sponsored the bill, an unprecedented measure. Never in peace time has the United States favored compulsory military training. As introduced, the proposal would require registration for military service of all men between twenty-one and forty-five. Men between eighteen and twenty-one and between forty-five and sixty-five would register for non-military service.

On Washington's Capitol Hill the Burke-Wadsworth bill recalled World War conscription, proposed by President Wilson in his war message of April 2, 1917, and approved by Congress six weeks later. The draft—it was revised to include all men from eighteen to forty-five, though originally only those between twenty-one and thirty-one were affected—brought registration of 47 per cent of all male Americans, a total of 24,234,000. Only one of every eight registered saw actual service.

Compulsory service in peacetime has always been regarded as contrary to traditional American democracy. Opponents argue: (1) A large army based on conscription would afford a base for dictatorial movements; (2) conscription is wasteful, since it withdraws men from production of economic goods; (3) volunteering would bring in as many recruits as are needed. But proponents of compulsory service drew upon an arsenal of strong arguments. Among them were: (1) Volunteering would *not* create as large an army as might be needed; (2) conscription would be more democratic than volunteering since it would affect all classes equally.

Child Refugees

In offices near New York's Union Square the United States Committee for the Care of European Children has been struggling with problems relating to what could become one of the greatest migrations in history. Phone calls swamped the volunteer workers. Letters poured in. Americans were rallying to aid children who might escape war's terrors, who, leaving Britain before it was too late, might need homes in the New World.

The child migration had already begun. By boat and plane they trickled into New York, many of the tow-headed boys and girls bearing names famous in the British peerage. To Canada ships brought several thousands.

The British government talked at first of evacuating to Canada and the United States all children. Lives would thus be saved, and the energies of adults remaining in Britain could be mustered solely to the nation's defense. Precious foodstuffs would not have to be diverted to children. The strain on morale would be lessened. In Parliament voices spoke of five million children to be taken overseas. Then trouble arose.

Warships were lacking to convoy the many vessels necessary to save the British youngsters. Parents began to feel that they would rather chance war's dangers than send their boys and girls to lands unknown and distant. Criticism arose that the rich were sending their children away, that the poor could not afford an American haven. In Commons Prime Minister Churchill deplored the dimensions reached by the child migration plan. It was unwise and unnecessary, he said. He promised that what offers of homes overseas were actually accepted would be shared equally by rich and poor.

Laval—Traitor or Patriot?

SINCE the collapse of France Pierre Laval, Vice Premier of the new authoritarian government, has had to bear a large share of the blame for the tragic events of the past few weeks. But is he the traitor that popular opinion believes him to be?

It is much too early to reach any definitive conclusions about the causes of the French disaster, but it is certainly not too early to examine Monsieur Laval's pre-war record. What manner of man is this swarthy Auvergnat whose white tie has become as much of a legend as his heavy black mustache? Rumor has it that this peasant's son has Moorish blood in his veins. Be that as it may, young Laval struggled hard for an education, obtained degrees in natural history and law and went to Paris. A socialist, he became attorney for a cab drivers' union and, in 1914, was elected to parliament from the suburb of Aubervilliers, perhaps the Reddest community in France.

Minister of Justice in 1926, he served under succeeding governments as Minister of Labor, Minister of Interior, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Premier, established himself as one of the most successful farmers in France and one of the outstanding members of the French bar, won the support of the great Briand. He served three times as Premier.

Not even Laval's admirers claim that he is an idealist. He is a cynical, hard-boiled realist. He is what the Germans call a *Realpolitiker.* Laval believes that this is a world of bitter international struggles, a hard world in which only the strong and resourceful can hope to survive against predatory neighbors. A nationalist, Laval has long been convinced that Frence could not hope alone to withstand vastly more populous Germany. Whatever his enemies may say today, Laval always kept his eyes fixed on France's frontier with the Reich.

When he succeeded the murdered Barthou as Foreign Minister in 1934, he took up his predecessor's attempts to build a wall of defensive encirclement around the Reich. Barthou had wanted to bring Italy into line. Laval followed this policy. The "Stresa front" (Britain, France and Italy) was a triumph for Laval's diplomacy. It promised to stop the march of Nazi Germany. But within a few months Britain and Italy were almost at war over Ethiopia.

Laval explained his attitude to me: "I was far more concerned with preventing the Germans from taking Austria than with the fate of Ethiopia. I was infinitely more concerned with preventing the Nazi fortification of the Rhineland than saving Haile Selassie. But as a lawyer I try to get the best settlement I can for a client. I tried to do that for the Ethiopians. But I repeat that my first consideration was the erection of defences to stop the Nazis. Ethiopia was secondary."

As the direct result of Anglo-Italian quarrels over the Ethiopian crisis, Hitler was able to march into the Rhineland. With this enormously important zone fortified, he could defy France. He could seize Austria, dismember Czechoslovakia and destroy Poland. Laval's forebodings about the Rhineland have proved only too true. At the time of Munich he was denounced because he opposed war. As he told me, France and Britain were not prepared to cope with Hitler. He wanted to stall for time during which the democracies could at least narrow the gap between the colossal armaments in the Reich and the tragically inadequate arms of the Franco-British.

Even Laval's bitter enemies recognize his acumen as a diplomat. Moorish ancestors or not, his diplomacy is marked by Asiatic cunning. As head of powerful France he could hold his own against dictators. Today, speaking for a defeated France, he faces an almost hopeless task.

Yet the peasants of Auvergne are hardy, dogged men. They do not give up easily. Pierre Laval probably reasons that the map of Europe has not been permanently drawn, that the "new order" planned by the Axis powers may be only a passing phase. It will take a hard-boiled *Realpolitiker* to bargain with Hitler and Mussolini. And a defeated France may possibly yet find that a Moroccan rug dealer's tactics are not to be despised as diplomatic technique. HENRY C. WOLFE

Fight to the Death

Winston Churchill, over a weekend in mid-July, left London for a brief rest at Chequers, the country estate that for nearly twenty years has been a refuge for British Prime Ministers. It was the first time Churchill had been to Chequers since becoming head of the government in May. The nineteen-hour day required to run a nation faced with military invasion did not allow for country rest. But in mid-July there was a lull in the fighting.

Across the Channel and the North Sea the Nazi legions were gathering for an attack upon Britain. In the ports of conquered Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and France ships and barges were being assembled to ferry an invading expedition. Air fields were being rushed to completion. Day after day, night after night, German bombers came over Britain to blast harbor works and factory towns in a foretaste of the Blitzkrieg promised and prophesied.

The Churchill Government had been busily preparing for the attack. Not since the time of Napoleon was the country so imperiled. Not since the Spanish Armada moved toward the Channel had such plans been made to meet an invader. At least a million men, gathered from the ends of the empire, were under arms in Britain. Another million had been enrolled in the home guards. Barricades shut country lanes and highways. Guns bristled along England's famous chalk cliffs. Beaches that in an ordinary summer would be thronged with bathers were tangles of barbed wire. The Royal Navy readied to fill its role as the steel bulwark of England.

The Royal Air Force, which had been ranging on bombing raids over Germany and German-conquered territory, prepared to meet the brunt of the attack. It admitted inferiority in numbers to the German air fleet. It claimed superiority in fighting quality. Whether quality could out-balance quantity remained to be seen.

As Britons awaited the zero hour, Adolf Hitler went before the German Reichstag to warn the British to make peace or face an-

nihilation. "I can see no reason why this war should go on," he said. But if Britain would not sue for peace, he added, then, "I predict a great empire will be destroyed, an empire that it was never my intention to destroy or even to harm." He was pitting his 80,000,000 Germans against a British Empire that numbered 450,000,000 people of all races. But, ten months after the war had begun, the empire with its vast resources and potential strength was not fully mobilized. Germany, however, was at its peak. Its armies had been tested in battle. Its war machine was geared to full speed. For Adolf Hitler and his country the supreme moment was at hand.

In the Shadow of War

On June 17, one day short of the anniversary of Waterloo, the French Republic asked Germany for an armistice. A lull was beginning in Europe's war while Hitler's Third Reich gathered all its strength for a knockout blow against Britain. The lull did not lessen world tension. The lengthening shadow of Adolf Hitler fell across all continents.

In that shadow the Republican party met in Philadephia on June 24 to select a 1940 Presidential candidate. In the same shadow the Democrats gathered in Chicago on July 15 to name their standard-bearer. What was done and what was said at both conventions reflected the thoughts of American men and women threatened by Europe's totalitarian revolution. The campaign now beginning will be shaped by that revolution before Americans march to the polls next November 5.

Crisis Candidates

Republicans and Democrats alike tossed tradition overboard at their 1940 conventions. When the G.O.P. picked Wendell L. Willkie as its Presidential candidate, it named, for the first time since 1868 when Ulysses S. Grant was the nominee, a man who had never held political office. The 48-year-old New York utility executive, moreover, until recently had been a Democrat in good standing. To Republicans the important thing was that with Willkie—his vigorous, colorful personality and his record as a business administrator were great assets—might come victory.

Similar sentiments moved the Democrats at Chicago to drop the anti-third-term tradition and name Franklin Delano Roosevelt for the Presidency. His popularity, his experience in directing the nation during domestic and foreign crises, his stand for social liberalism, all pointed to him as the one Democrat most likely to bring the party victory in November.

After the tumult and the shouting of the conventions had died away, after the bunting had been taken down and the delegates had gone home—then could we ponder the lessons of the conventions.

Underlying the more obvious and perennial party search for victory were the deep-seated issues of the 1940 campaign. Both candidates were in essential agreement on foreign policy. Neither wanted to take the United States into the maelstrom of Europe's war, but both favored aid to Britain insofar as possible—short of actual dispatch of naval vessels or khaki-clad soldiers. Both favored strengthening American defenses against the day when the totalitarian revolution might menace the United States or its South American fields of interest.

Neither Mr. Willkie nor President Roosevelt fell out over the need of building tanks or planes or battleships. Where they did disagree was on how to build a strong nation to support the armed forces. In short, they had different ideas in regard to civilian morale. It was natural that President Roosevelt, as well as his party, should place emphasis on the New Deal's continuance. For the Republican Willkie the emphasis was, not in abolishing the New Deal, but in tempering it, removing its restraints on business and encouraging the great American middle-class to gird up its loins in defense of democracy.

The War-Born Issue

Boiled down, with all the resounding oratory forgotten, with all prejudices temporarily shoved aside, the essential issue of the 1940 campaign became just this: Which party offered the best guarantee that democracy could be defended in a fascist-menaced world?

The question was implicit and partly defined in the platforms of both parties. It was stated in the speeches of the two candidates. For Americans the impending election thus promised to be more important than any since Abraham Lincoln in 1864 entered the lists against General George B. McClellan.

The issue might thus be clarified. The campaign's course could not be predicted. What voters might think and feel would be affected directly by what was happening in Europe, 3,000 miles across the Atlantic. By November 5, Britain might be crushed and Germany might be ready to extend her domination over American regions of the mangled British Empire. In that event, how would voters decide as between President Roosevelt and Mr. Willkie? And what would be the campaign effect if Britain, attacked from all sides, withstood the German onslaught?

Planners of the candidates' strategy and the candidates themselves had to bear these questions in mind. To a great extent the 1940 campaign would thus not be the repetition of 1916 that it had at one time promised to be. When Woodrow Wilson and Charles Evans Hughes opposed each other, the "He-kept-us-out-of-war" slogan was largely responsible for the Wilson victory, for the Republicans had allowed themselves to be dubbed the "war party." In the weeks ahead no "war party" will oppose a "peace party."

When Walter Lippmann surveyed the Republican and Democratic conventions of 1940, he reached this conclusion: "The politicians of both parties would like to fight the campaign of 1936 over again. . . . But 1940 is as far removed from 1936 as Hitler is from Queen Victoria. The strength of Willkie and Roosevelt is that they know this. The basic fact about public sentiment is that people know this. . . . And that is why, when the politicians had played their part as long as they could play it, both conventions accepted leadership and left to their chosen leaders the task of making policy for the future."

W. L. W.

Willkie

vs.

Roosevelt!

LINDSAY ROGERS

OUR 1940 curtain-raisers, the national nominating conventions, are now over. This year, as democratic institutions, they were more heartening than they frequently are. Both in Philadelphia and in Chicago they offered novel attractions. As the Presidential campaign gets into full swing it is clear that it will differ from most of its predecessors. The candidates are different: Franklin D. Roosevelt asks a third consecutive term and thus challenges a tradition which is long-standing and may prove to be deep-seated. Wendell L. Willkie is a political amateur—a recent recruit from the Democratic party—who owes his opportunity to the belief of the Republicans that, to defeat Roosevelt, they must have a candidate who is "different". Campaign strategy will be influenced by, and victory or defeat may depend on, events outside the United States. Never before —1916 was no exception—has the shadow of a threatening Europe been so dark and the menace of a foreign war so affrighting.

For three months the one great remaining democracy in the world must divert some of its attention and energies from the foreign situation. It must devote itself to internal politics and must do so mindful of the fact that one of the reasons for France's collapse was that, when the safety of the state was imperiled, politics were not adjourned. For us the danger is not immediate, but it ought to be kept in mind. At the political shows of Chicago and Philadelphia, some—but not much —attention was given to it. But before dealing with this, let me enumerate some of the novel attractions for which the 1940 conventions will be remembered.

Twice before a Democratic convention had nominated the same candidate thrice, but Grover Cleveland failed of election after his second nomination and William Jennings Bryan never was elected. Why was the Democratic party willing this year to shatter the convention that no President should have more than two terms? It realized that its best chance of winning would be with Mr. Roosevelt and that if it refused to give him the nomination which he desired and his support of any other candidate was lukewarm, defeat would be certain. Moreover, the party had no other candidate for whom there was any general enthusiasm.

This is not the place to discuss the justification of the tradition that two terms are enough. It is sufficient to say that Mr. Roosevelt will lose many votes because, if reelected, he would have a third term. On the other hand, his personal following will give him votes which would not go to any other candidate. He, more than anyone else, can derive maximum benefit from the huge federal bureaucracy which he has created and from the millions who feed at the federal trough. And, given the international situation, his candidacy may draw support from those who heed the warning which Abraham Lincoln quoted in 1864: "Don't swap horses when crossing a stream."

To the delegates at Chicago, Mrs. Roosevelt announced that her husband could not "make a campaign in the usual sense of the word. He must be on his job." Those who nominated him would have to make the campaign. Later the President in his radio address to the convention declared that, "as I think my good wife suggested an hour or so ago", his campaigning would be reduced to

Professor Rogers, Burgess Professor of Public Law at Columbia University since 1929, and widely known writer, discusses the candidates, platforms and issues in what will be one of the most important campaigns in American history

F. D. R.

the necessity of keeping in touch with Washington "and even Europe and Asia by direct telephone" and, because of "the splendid work of the new defense machinery," of spending "vastly more time in conference with responsible administrative heads under me." He would report to the country periodically but "would not have the time or the inclination to engage in purely political debate."

Is the inference that what the Republican candidate says will be political debate while what the Democratic candidate says will be no more than reporting to the country on his stewardship? My guess is that the Democratic National Committee will buy some radio time for these periodic reports.

But if the Democratic convention was "bossed" and given no alternative save to re-nominate President Roosevelt (thus differing from many of its predecessors), the Republican convention in Philadelphia was even more unprecedented in the unimportance of "smoke-filled rooms" where "practical politicians" reach decisions for obedient delegates. Party bosses never want a candidate like Mr. Willkie. They prefer a "regular" Republican to an amateur with whom they will have a better chance of winning. And in this case the amateur was one who had lately been a Democrat.

Partisanship aside, there are few, I think, who would dare challenge the judgment that at Philadelphia one of the institutions of American democracy functioned with outstanding success. Believers in representative government could take heart. Perhaps the nomination of Mr. Willkie was due in part to a belief that the Democrats would nominate Mr. Roosevelt and that therefore the Republicans must put their best foot forward even though the best foot had lately been in the opposite party. But many voters who want to see Mr. Roosevelt reelected applauded the choice because, if their idol cannot be successful again, they would prefer that the occupant of the White House should be a man of Mr. Willkie's intellectual courage and administrative abilities.

Of course, when the full story of the Philadelphia convention is written, the country will learn in detail what sophisticated opinion suspected: that Willkie's nomination was brought about by extremely shrewd pressures which were stimulated throughout the country and by highly adroit management on the floor of the convention. Those mechanics, however, would not have been successful had there not been in the country a latent, general and sincere feeling that Willkie was of Presidential stature and that the Republican convention should nominate him. What in Philadelphia seemed to be spontaneity may have been in considerable measure a manufactured article, but the manufacturing could not have been completed if there had not been real raw materials on which the artisans could work. Moreover, the artisans were largely amateurs. They routed the "old guard". (At Chicago the "old guard" was afraid to fight.) Of course Wall Street wanted Willkie but it was afraid to do much for him openly and the amateurs carried the day not because of but in spite of this support.

In other words, irrespective of the results of the election, the 1940 conventions should, I suggest, be looked upon as memorable in that each of them put forward a Presidential candidate who could make the best possible race for his party. The

campaign should therefore be more interesting than campaigns frequently are. Mr. Roosevelt's electioneering prowess has been demonstrated. Mr. Willkie is more of an unknown quantity. His nomination was certainly aided by—indeed it might not have been possible without—the sense of hu-

mor which he showed in respect of his candidacy, his frankness of speech, and his genuine liking for, and ability to get along with, all kinds of people—qualities which Mr. Roosevelt, too, possesses in full measure. Will Mr. Willkie continue to be himself during the campaign or will he put himself in bondage to the "practical politicians" who not infrequently fail to realize that the best politics may be to seem not to care about politics?

In radio presence, Mr. Roosevelt will probably have the advantage of Mr. Willkie, but in this respect the latter is immeasurably better than recent Republican aspirants. That other important invention which has profound influence on voting—the cinema—will not handicap Mr. Willkie. Moreover, as his press conferences have demonstrated, he is good in catch-as-catch-can repartee. Presidents Coolidge and Hoover were always ill at ease in press conferences. They were reluctant to appear in mental undress. President Roosevelt has always had a gift of being attractive in mental undress. Mr. Willkie has the same gift, and it should improve by practice.

Party regularity was not a *sine qua non* for the Republican Presidential nominee, nor for the Democratic nominee for the Vice Presidency. The Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace, is an ex-Republican. Like his opponent, the Republican leader in the Senate—Charles L. McNary—he gives the ticket geographic "balance": New York (Georgia) and Iowa versus New York (Indiana) and Oregon. Of the Vice Presidency Woodrow Wilson once said that the position is "one of anomalous insignificance and curious uncertainty," and added that the Vice President's "chief dignity next to presiding over the Senate lies in the circumstance that he is awaiting the death or disability of the President. And the chief embarrassment in discussing his office is that in explaining how little there is to be said about it one has evidently said all there is to say." But nine of the thirty-two Vice Presidents have become President—six of them through the death of the preceding President. What Woodrow Wilson called a "chief dignity" is also a statistical possibility.

Latterly, Presidents have returned to the original practice of admitting Vice Presidents to Cabinet councils. Vice President Garner was of immense assistance as a pilot of legislation. If elected, Senator McNary could play the same role, but it is doubtful whether he "strengthens" his ticket to the extent that Secretary Wallace "strengthens" his. Both make an appeal to agriculture and, if the electoral system permitted it, a good many Republican farmers would probably vote for Wallace for Vice President. On the other hand, some of Senator McNary's votes in the Senate were in conflict with the Republican platform and will not be approved by the Presidential candidate's speeches. But this matter is one of small moment.

For the platforms, there must be far less enthusiasm than for the candidates. Editorial writers regularly lament the fact that party platforms straddle important issues. They forget that the platforms can hardly do anything else. American national parties are based on sectional parties. Hence the political principles around which they coalesce must be extremely vague. Bottles with old labels are refilled with the wine of successive years. Naturally the wine does not correspond with the label and most of the time it is not vintage but *vin ordinaire*. Always, however ,the platforms rededicate the parties to their "historical principles" and here the chief line of cleavage is always the same: the party which is in wants to stay there and the party, whose horde of office-seekers has remained hungry, wishes to feed them.

Neither of the 1940 conventions broke with this tradition. On the most important question confronting the American people—the war and its impact on us—the platforms are practically indistinguishable. Each faces both ways. The Democrats promise not to participate in foreign wars or to send armed forces "outside of the Americas except in case of attack". The Republicans firmly oppose "involving this nation in foreign war". Both favor, for "liberty-loving peoples," material aid not "in violation of international law or inconsistent with the requirements of our own national defense." The promises are almost identical. Both parties are willing to spend anything that is necessary for national defense but the Democrats point with pride to what has been done and the Republicans view with alarm the paucity of the preparations that have resulted from huge expenditures.

Detailed comparison of the platforms in other respects would be futile. Their promises will not be

important in determining votes and will not be too rigorously adhered to by the party which is successful. There is a story in Disraeli's novel, *Coningsby,* of two English political agents who were worried by the necessity of having a party campaign cry. Finally "Our young Queen and our old institution" was selected because it sounded well and meant absolutely nothing. The Republican platform reads as if the Republican slogan was "Our new Republican recruit and our old party faith," which seems to mean a swiping of the New Deal from the New Dealers. Old-age pensions are to be "extended"; stock exchanges are to be regulated; relief is to be continued but through the states. Agriculture is to be subsidized, etc., etc.

Similarly, the collection of platitudes which forms the Democratic platform exudes self-satisfaction which to opponents will seem nauseating, to supporters will seem deserved and to detached observers will at least seem somewhat saccharine. It ignores the fact that the unemployed still number ten millions and that deficits are mounting. It says nothing about balancing the budget. The Republican platform does promise to deal with these matters but naturally does not tell us how.

From neither platform will a reader learn of the fateful times that are in store for this country, not only in respect of military preparations and of the danger that they may be incompetently handled, but in respect of preparations for more and more control of economic life, for defense against economic warfare which must be by methods not dissimilar to—although perhaps less extreme than—the ways in which European states conduct economic warfare. And what of dwindling international trade and the necessity of finding some substitute in the form of internal economic activity governmentally directed? This problem would be pressing even if peace—real peace—suddenly broke out in Europe and Asia; but on it the platforms are silent.

Fortunate it is, however, that on foreign affairs the planks did straddle. Hence we are able to escape the distressing consequences which would have followed if one party had attempted to establish itself as a peace party and had branded its opponents as a war party. On the question of aid for Great Britain and for what we propose to defend, each party contains differing schools of thought. Weasel words were therefore inevitable. Between the Presidential candidates, on this issue, there is, as yet, no clear divergence.

The fact that the candidates are as able as any their parties could put forward may raise the tone of the campaign which is now on. Not infrequently in Presidential campaigns the American electorate has been treated as if it were composed exclusively of morons. Each party's candidate has been afraid to lose votes by forthright opinions. The result is that American Presidential campaigns are much like the Parliamentary warfare which Lord Balfour once described. The protagonists beat each other over the heads with verbal bladders. They thus cause a maximum of noise but do a minimum of damage.

To an extent this is a healthy situation because an American President comes into office without an overwhelming majority of the electorate recorded in his behalf. There will be forty per cent or more of the people of the country who, even though they have voted against him, will be willing to give him a trial. A campaign which was too heated, too bitter, might make the losers unwilling to lose. When that happens, democracy gives way to dictatorship.

With this risk in mind, Roosevelt and Willkie can nevertheless conduct their campaigns so as to educate the country and prepare it for the discipline to which it must submit and the sacrifice of comfort to which it must consent. Events may overtake the candidates and run in advance of them as the candidates are now in advance of the practical politicians. As is always the case, large portions of the electorate will vote against rather than for: two terms are enough; we should have a President who is less mercurial and more willing to master hard facts; we must have a President who will pay attention to good housekeeping. On the other hand, many will doubtless be unwilling to put an ex-public utilities magnate in the White House; they will fear an attempt to dismantle or at least a refusal to build further the structure of benefit for the underprivileged which is vaguely described as the New Deal. Some will vote against Mr. Willkie because they fear the Republican Tapers and Tadpoles who would endeavor to ride into Washington on his coat-tails.

Whether it knows it or not, the electorate will in effect be saying who in its opinion can best direct the energies of the country for the task which confronts it—of preparing for armed defense and for the new economic world in which we shall have to live even if the guns and planes never have to be used. The electorate will not quite understand what it is deciding. It will vote largely on other, and, in these fateful times, somewhat irrelevant, considerations. But the result will be to put the direction of the national energies in the hands of one candidate and the aides whom he either chooses or who are forced upon him rather than in the hands of the other candidate and his similarly selected entourage. It will be a great and solemn referendum and it will be free. It proceeds at an hour when all European democracies save one have been blacked out, and when Great Britain is in a shadow which, as these lines are written, is not growing lighter.

Britain's Fleet Our Shield

Its destruction would have far-reaching consequences which in this article are carefully weighed and measured

COMMANDER MELVIN F. TALBOT (SC), U. S. Navy

IN 1802 rumors reached President Thomas Jefferson that the Province of Louisiana was about to pass back from the feeble grip of Spain into the mighty grasp of Napoleonic France. They stirred him to write that the time had come for the United States to "marry themselves to the British Fleet and Nation."

Jefferson was an isolationist, a life long friend of republican France and foe of Perfidious Albion. His warning against "entangling alliances" is on every schoolboy's lips. Nevertheless, he would have openly sought an out-and-out alliance with the British fleet as our strongest shield against victorious continental militarism.

Such a shield that fleet in truth has been from those troubled months which preceded the Louisiana Purchase down to the present day. Behind the British battle line we at first sheltered our pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine. A British squadron stood between Admiral Dewey and the threat of German interference at Manila. And, in the World War, it was the British fleet, ably reinforced by our own, which kept open the troop ship lanes from Hoboken to Brest and Saint Nazaire.

Should the British Isles now be invaded and subjugated, the Royal Navy would either pass into the hands of Germany or, what is more likely, would expend itself in one last gallant battle or would withdraw to Canada, where, from lack of docks and technical supplies, it would soon lose its ability to cruise or to fight. Here it would be dependent on our own navy yards and shipbuilding plants for the repairs and replacements without which the mightiest fleet must soon succumb to the decay which so quickly follows inaction.

What would such an eventuality mean to us in terms of national defense in the dangerous world of today? What would it mean in the future?

The immediate danger to America would be both sharp and real. Even with the British fleet sunk beneath the waves, forever beyond the conqueror's grasp, or rusting away in the St. Lawrence River, the naval might of Germany with her captured French reinforcements, plus Italy, plus Japan, would seriously threaten our present control of the South Atlantic and our splendid experiment in Colonial self-government in the Philippines. South America, whose potential agricultural and mineral wealth balances the strained economy of Europe, might conceivably yield to economic and political penetration and become a ready base for future aggression against the Caribbean and the Canal Zone. Nor could we fully trust our shipbuilding industry swiftly to outstrip the combined facilities of Europe and Japan in a hurried attempt to achieve naval supremacy.

Not for the next six years at least could we regain mastery of the Western Seas. The reason is not far to seek. Shipyards are as difficult to construct as are the battleships which they themselves eventually produce. Back of the navy yards are the machine tools, the railroad extensions, the shops and the power houses, the dwellings for thousands of laborers and mechanics. What we must create is in the last analysis not fighting ships nor even the additional yards to build them, but rather an entire industrial speed-up which must go back all the way to the mine head.

Congressional appropriations can be passed in an afternoon. Money can be rushed off the presses in a week. But the ways and the labor needed to build modern fighting ships in greatly increased numbers cannot be found in a few months. Should the British fleet be lost, we shall have, somehow, to pass through five or six dangerous years while we prepare the forges of Vulcan from which will eventually come the weapons of Mars.

Dangerous years are nothing new in American history. Our nation was born in the agony and bloody sweat of a world war. Only some ten years after Yorktown, another world war burst upon a United States almost completely disarmed and hemmed in by European territory on the north, the west and the south. Those were dangerous days indeed. But somehow we survived them. We were masters of the diplomatic game of playing for time while creating the material weapons of war. We had to buy respite at the price of partial withdrawal. We had temporarily to withhold our just claims to the trade of the Caribbean and even to forego the navigation of our own

Mississippi. As the foreign conflict became more menacing, we cautiously withdrew our shipping from the high seas. These were retreats indeed. But the turning came. In 1812 we were able gloriously to vindicate our naval ensign at sea, and in the two following years successfully defended our shores and our frontiers against permanent invasion.

POSSIBLY we must soon face a similar problem, should the shield of British sea power be shattered before our own can be adequately strengthened. Possibly our influence and interests in the Far East will suffer. The white man's treaty rights in the Orient may be completely swept away. South American markets may be lost for a while. But surely the control of the waters from our Pacific bastion at Hawaii east to the Canal and north to an ever friendly Canada would be ours, at least to dispute so desperately that over them no army of invasion could pass. If, in the face of the present United States fleet, a conqueror from Asia or from Europe, or conquerors from both at once, should make so bold as actually to invade our shores, our country, bulwarked by the broad oceans, defended by a rapidly expanding army, strengthened by a high degree of industrial efficiency and almost completely independent of imports, once fully aroused to war, could beat off any and all attacks.

The immediate danger which we must face in the event of Britain's defeat is, then, the probable loss of our waning prestige in the East and our mastery of the waters of the entire Western Hemisphere. These were the basic policies around which were constructed the 5-5-3 ratios of the now defunct naval limitation treaties. A fleet equal in combatant tonnage to Britain's and superior to Japan's once assured us complete safety in the west together with some prospect of maintaining our historic and peaceful policies in the Orient. Not one of all the statesmen and naval strategists who negotiated those treaties ever envisioned the possibility that Britain's fleet might some day cease to stand between us and the navies of a future continental alliance. In fact it was not until the lightning German victories of this spring that America awoke to the danger that her interests in the Orient and in South America might be simultaneously threatened by a combination of powers, each deploying great naval, military and air forces and each committed to a system of internal government and a foreign policy seemingly opposed to our desire for peace and stability within the structure of the Monroe Doctrine. Such, however, is the menace which we face today. It is a menace which only the ability of Britain to maintain her sovereignty, her empire, and, most important of all, her fleet can fully and immediately abate.

It is not, however, inevitable that the destruction of the British fleet will be the signal for an immediate attack upon our interests in Asia and in South America. War weariness may force the conqueror to stay his hand. Nor is it inconceivable that he may choose friendly relations with the United States rather than the diplomatic and economic frictions which lead to war. Europe, with access to the raw materials of Africa and Asia, has a large measure of self-containment. A managed European economy need not of necessity capture the resources of South America. As for the Orient, it has always been possible for an accommodation between Japan and China to become the basis of a new and more stable economic and political order in the Far East. Should these considerations rather than the desire for further and dangerous conquests actuate a Germany victorious over the British fleet, we shall be given time to reorient our own foreign policies and to then prepare all of the armaments necessary to vindicate them.

If this happily be the case, we shall, I believe, use our breathing spell to create and, far more important, to maintain the fleet which President Wilson once sought, the fleet "incomparably the

most efficient in the world." We shall become and, what is far more essential, we shall long remain great upon the seas, great in the sense of possessing that clear preponderance which no combination of foes will think to menace. We shall take to ourselves that unquestioned superiority at sea which in the old days built and bulwarked the British Empire.

Heretofore both our foreign and naval policies have been predicated on a balance of world power, a balance into which we could at any time throw our weight and tip the scales to our own advantage. The American fleets and armies of the Revolution,

the War of 1812 and even the World War supplied the decisive reinforcement to a foreign struggle otherwise deadlocked and thus enabled us as a nation to vindicate our own policies without fighting for them singlehanded against a hostile world. Were the British fleet now to be erased from the picture, we would be forced to go it alone. No one who has lived his life in the United States Navy can doubt our ability to defend our shores and even the entire Western Hemisphere against any conceivable foe granted we have time to prepare and granted further that our people will bear the burden of great armaments steadily and even proudly year after year.

No one would have believed a decade ago that an apparently bankrupt Germany, an impoverished Italy, and an island Japan could have made themselves the world's leading nations in arms. What these peoples have done we can also do. In fact we, with our vastly superior natural resources, can eventually outstrip them. The problem is one of organization, of the will and the courage to act. It is not for us a question of foregoing butter in order to create bullets. We can have both. The problem is rather that of sharply reorienting our productive effort. The cost, alas, is likely to fall most heavily on those who have a vested interest in the order of things as they are. Changes in that order there must and will be. We cannot quickly buy greatly increased armaments through the ordinary process of commercial purchase. Rather we shall of necessity direct their procurement in a partially controlled economy, which, during its transition period, will of necessity withdraw materials and labor from certain established industries.

If much of the work of brain and hand which now produces our pleasing variety of styles and novelties and trivia must be redirected into the manufacture of arms, we shall perforce live in a simpler, more Spartan, and perhaps in the end a more loveable America, an America more closely akin to the nation that knew the weary winter of Valley Forge, the red hell of Gettysburg, and the triumph of Belleau Wood. And if in happier years not now in sight man should consider beating his swords into plow shares, we would of necessity plan and cushion that equally disturbing change, emerging with something approaching managed production. Rededicated to a renewed attack on the poverty which need no longer deface modern society. This, as I see it, is the price of security. Surely it is not too high for us to pay in order that we may pass on to our children unimpaired the national greatness we inherited from our fathers.

Such then are the implications for us of today's war in Europe. If the British Empire and the British fleet are to survive, we shall escape the most imminent dangers inherent in a German victory. We shall avoid a period of forced rearmament so hurried as to distort the familiar structure of our social and economic life. We shall see the reestablishment of that balance of power which has made it unnecessary for us to maintain great armaments like those of Europe and Asia. Those who would pray for peace in our time may well pray that the White Ensign continue to fly triumphant in the English Channel, that "moat defensive to her house," that "water-walled bulwark still secure and confident from foreign purposes." A defense of England sufficiently successful or even sufficiently prolonged to assure the continued existence of the British fleet is our first line of defense in South America and in the Orient.

Our reliance on the navy of England will, I believe, be only temporary. We shall soon build our own defenses, a fleet in each ocean superior to any conceivable combination of enemies. We have learned our lesson. Never again in our time will we rely on the precarious balance of power abroad. Never again will we put our full trust in the British fleet. England is now too near the air and submarine bases of the continent and too susceptible to blockade to continue her former role as a buffer between the conquering armies of Europe and the exposed coasts of Brazil and the Argentine. No longer at the first threat of danger

can we seek, as President Jefferson once sought, to "marry ourselves to the British Fleet and Nation," even if that fleet survives the sharpest threat England has ever faced.

If the British fleet outrides the storms of the present as it has outridden many a dangerous storm in the past, we shall have time to prepare in an orderly way our own vastly augmented naval armaments. If that fleet succumbs before the bombers, transport planes and submarines of a hostile Europe, we may be forced temporarily to withdraw our interests in South America and the Orient pending the time some six years hence when we shall ourselves deploy at sea a naval might none will dare dispute. We shall then no longer depend upon the course of war on distant continents. We shall have achieved our historic destiny, the right and the power, ourselves, singlehanded and against all comers, to defend the waters of the Western Hemisphere as the guardians of American democracy and American liberties.

The opinions and assertions contained in this article are the private ones of the author and are not to be construed as official or as reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the naval service at large.—M. F. Talbot

This Is Our Strength

Adolf Hitler has done one good deed. He has killed Britain's complacency, this English journalist says

VERNON BARTLETT

ADOLF HITLER receives few expressions of admiration from the British and deserves less. But in one respect, at any rate, we should be thankful to him—he has succeeded in jerking us out of the deep ruts on the road towards complacency and decay. His conquest of France will compel us, for example, to alter most of our conceptions of political geography.

We in Great Britain have long been accustomed to think of ourselves first as Europeans and only secondly as citizens of an Empire with territories in every continent. Benumbed by blow after blow, we are left with the conviction that we are now a small and lonely island of liberal thought on the outskirts of a Continent dominated by National Socialism. We still utter phrases of defiance and feel rather proud of ourselves for doing so. But this conception of our role, if somewhat heroic, is also somewhat misleading.

We are not the last remnant of liberal thought; on the contrary, we are the bridgehead of that thought and we have behind us vast millions of people in America, Australia, Africa and Asia who share our conceptions of individual rights and freedoms. No man who defends a bridgehead in enemy territory has an easy time of it, and in our case we are divided from our mainland not by a mere ribbon of a river but by a mighty stretch of ocean.

But let us, at any rate, do away with the idea that we stand alone. There are in the many territories that have come under Hitler's heel millions who would look upon our victory as their victory, but we dare not hope for much help from them even when the structure of the Nazi regime begins to crack and crumble. For it is now an established part of Hitler's technique to destroy all the potential leaders of the countries he takes under his

"protection," as well as to starve the wish to revolt out of the masses. But we have a heartening amount of support from states across the seas. Their increasing desire to share our burden should be a great source of strength in these anxious weeks before their war materials are at our disposal.

A few months ago there was danger of disturbances in India, such as we had not known for years; the Union of South Africa had only come into the war by a small parliamentary majority; Hitler and Mussolini were confidently predicting every kind of uprising amongst the Arabs, the Jews and many of the other races that are governed by Whitehall. But the Empire which was to disintegrate is now magnificently united. We in London have been dangerously and disgracefully slow to appreciate the problems of British subjects in distant Continents. And our gratitude to them now should be all the greater as also our determination to meet their demands—if we claim to fight for Democracy the least we can do is to be democrats in our own Commonwealth.

The United States, starting with a dislike of the Nazis but a suspicion that every Englishman wanted to involve Americans in war and every German wanted to keep them out of it, has shown within the last few weeks a degree of solidarity which wins not only our gratitude but still more our satisfaction that the ideals in which we believe are so widely held. We who have to defend this bridgehead of civilization called Britain have the certain knowledge that, can we but hold out, irresistible reinforcements will come our way.

But can we hold out? It would be deceitful and foolish to under-estimate the odds against us. To all intents and purposes the coastline of Western Europe from the Arctic to the Adriatic Sea is at the disposal of our enemies. Those of us who attacked the British Government's complacent and hypocritical policy during the Spanish civil war, because we feared that a Franco victory would enable Hitler to base his submarines on Spanish ports, were right to be alarmed. But how much greater must our alarm now be when Norway with its deep protective fjords, Holland and Belgium with their air-fields, and France with its ports in such proximity to ours, must obey Nazi commands. The iron ore of Lorraine now goes into the manufacture of German tanks and guns. The great food supplies of France can be diverted to fill Nazi stomachs. The imperative demand for oil cannot be met as a result of these conquests and the destruction of the mechanized German army must have been very great indeed, but Mussolini and the other international jackals slink hopefully along not behind Churchill but behind Hitler.

In such a war as this only stubborn will power

can overcome the superior striking force of the machine. The obvious weaknesses of the democratic system allowed that superiority to be reached by the Nazis; we have now to see whether the spiritual strength that we believe should come to us from our respect for justice and freedom can provide the necessary compensation. If we were to be defeated it would be, I believe, because our system had become outworn; because mankind was taking a fresh stride along the path of progress. It would not be that complete and utter defeat, that collapse of civilization, which so many expect, for neither the German nor any other people would fight with such vigor if it had no ideals to inspire it. A National Socialist conquest of the world would involve during the next few years more widespread misery than any other event in history. But the very fact that it conquered would, I believe, show that the idea behind it was more in keeping with the scientific and other developments of the moment than the ideal behind democracy.

As far as I am concerned, the victory of National Socialism would be a great defeat and disaster, for there is no room in a National Socialist world for kindliness and humor. But I should feel that I had no cause to complain—the defeat of democracy would be due only to the failure of democrats to support with sufficient passionate faith their own way of living. It is because I cannot believe that democracy has ceased to be a great and good force that I remain an optimist.

Let's Listen to Swing

Several times a week millions of persons hear this radio commentator solve politico-military puzzles

EARL SPARLING

Newspaperman, author of books on economic subjects

NOTHING has astonished the broadcasting studios more than the spectacular rise of Raymond Gram Swing. Up to February 1939 his commentary on a mad world was carried only once a week by only one American station, WOR, in New York, and then at any chance hour, a sort of station fill-in. Previous to that he had been fired from another spot, the executive deciding flatly that he had neither a radio personality nor a radio voice.

Today he discourses five times a week, sometimes oftener, over a Mutual Broadcasting System network of up to eighty stations to an audience of as many as nine million persons. He has won that audience against such imposing direct competition as Guy Lombardo, Kay Kyser, Bob Crosby, Glenn Miller, not to mention Bob Hope, Don Ameche, Bing Crosby and Toscanini. At times he has had to pitch his dry, solemn voice against the entire galaxy through a week. How well he has held his own is indicated by a survey on a recent night when he was talking against one of the famous name bands. Of all radio sets in operation in a broad test area in the East, 32 per cent were listening to swing music, 39 per cent were listening to Swing.

Three times a week, moreover, his talk is broadcast shortwave all over the earth by WRUL (World Radio University).

To the listener, Swing seems a miraculous jigsaw puzzle solver. Everybody reads the foreign news these days, but very few can fit the myriad events and rumors into a coherent whole. Swing can. With deceptive ease he moulds the hodgepodge of reports into a sharply defined picture of the actual situation at the moment. His delivery is unique. He is gentle, yet forceful; assured, but never pompous. He never raises his voice; he stresses important points simply by increasing his intensity and pace.

Swing has his own explanation of his former failure and present success: "When I began broadcasting in America five years ago, I tried to give attention to what was significant, not what was merely dramatic. Most Americans were enthusiastically disinterested. Until crisis followed crisis and led inexorably toward war Americans did not have time for the significant things. The simple truth of my success is that the war has scared Americans to death."

Behind that explanation lie several others. First, when his chance came Swing was ready. He knew what was significant because he had learned Europe inside out during twenty-one years as foreign correspondent for American newspapers. Second, he had studied broadcasting technique and knew how to reduce the significant things to terms the average man could understand. Although he broke upon the American radio public as pretty much a man out of nowhere, he had been preparing for a radio career for years.

In the early days of broadcasting he bought so many costly receiving sets and sat up with them so late at night that his family coined a reproving phrase: "Papa's electric train." John Gunther recalls his first visit to the Swing home in London: "It was about 1924. I found him sprawled over a lot of mechanical stuff. He said it was a radio. It was the first I had ever seen. He spoke of how radio would bring the world into every home, of how it would be possible to talk to audiences so vast as to be almost uncountable. His set was not working very well. I had a hard time believing."

Swing got his first chance at a microphone in 1930, a radio interview with S. K. Ratcliffe, the English lecturer, for the British Broadcasting Company. The next year he broadcast from Geneva for the National Broadcasting Company, one of the early experiments in trans-Atlantic radio news coverage. In 1932, talking from London to a Columbia Broadcasting System official in New York, he made the first trans-Atlantic two-way broadcast in radio history.

Three years later, back in the United States, he began broadcasting to England, the only American ever invited by the British Broadcasting Company to give weekly trans-Atlantic comment on the American scene. These broadcasts, repeated in recent years to Canada, given only fortnightly after the war began, continued until last June 1. Then he had to abandon them because of the pressure of his American work. Long before the mil-

lions in America began discovering him in 1939 it is estimated that fully 30 per cent of the adult population followed him habitually in Great Britain.

American radio men knew about his popularity in England but they discounted it. They reasoned that the English had a different attitude toward world affairs, that Americans had neither the training nor temperament for such heavy fare. Even with all that has happened since they gave him his chance at a national hookup their former attitude is understandable. The executive who once fired him had something on his side. In himself, beyond his material, Raymond Gram Swing would not seem the man capable of mass appeal.

In appearance he could be any fresh water college professor, one slightly overburdened with lectures. He returned to this country in 1934 pretty much the same plain unvarnished Mid-Westerner who ventured abroad in 1912. Neither his clothes nor his bearing betray that he roamed the capitals of Europe for two decades or that he is currently enjoying an income that makes the tax collectors rub their hands.

Sensitive, reticent, somewhat aloof, he lacks an ability to dramatize himself. He also lacks lightness and sometimes seems to have trouble smiling. He doesn't grin, as most men might, if you ask why he got kicked out of Oberlin College in Ohio, where both his parents were faculty members. His face grows pained: "Don't. It was one of the most humiliating experiences of my life. I just didn't study hard enough."

Oberlin tried to right things last June 11 by giving him an honorary D. Lit. degree. Five days later Olivet College in Michigan gave him an honorary LL.D., and he delivered a commencement address so deep in meaning that the school and the radio studios were swamped with demands for printed copies. No commencement address in the history of education ever caused such a furore, but Swing still worries about his youthful academic failings.

After leaving Oberlin he became a newspaper man, working on the side as a church organist and choir conductor. His hobby right up to the present time is composing music, although he kept it a dark secret until a friend got hold of one of his works, "A Fantasia quassi una Sonata," and had it performed at a Composers' Forum concert in New York last April. Later it was broadcast over a Mutual hookup and Swing, as proud as punch, admitted he had a small trunk full of songs, sonatas, cantatas, divertimenti and such.

MUSIC brought him and his wife together. He met Betty Gram, a militant suffragette who had been arrested five times for picketing, at a concert tea in Berlin in 1920. She agreed to marry him but declined to take his name. They were married almost at once and at once trouble began.

European hotel clerks had never heard of the Lucy Stone League. They stared down their noses at a couple who registered as man and wife but who signed different names, Raymond Edwards Swing and Betty Gram. After a number of trying situations Swing took things in hand. "Look," he said in that analytical voice: "if you'll take my name, I'll take yours." That's how he became Raymond Gram Swing.

But in London he is known informally and a trifle hilariously as Silas Q. Swing. In 1915 he was on his way to cover the bloody Gallipoli action when the little Turkish steamer on which he was crossing the Sea of Marmora was stopped by a British submarine. Swing was the only man on board who could speak English.

"Will you give us time to get into the boats?" he shouted.

"Yes," came the answer. "But be jolly well quick. Who are you?"

"I am Raymond Swing of *The Chicago Daily News*."

"Glad to meet you, Mr. Swing," responded the submarine commander, "but . . . er . . . if you please, what is the name of your *ship?*"

To the sea-minded British that story of a landlubber American introducing himself personally to a sub crew about to blow up his ship was a priceless anecdote of the first World War. Rudyard Kipling immortalized it wryly in his history of British submarine warfare. By mistake the submarine commander (now Admiral Martin Eric Dunbar-Nasmith) entered Swing's name in his log as Silas Q. Swing of *The Chicago Sun*, which is

the way it went down in Kipling's account and the official British annals.

Swing became a foreign correspondent somewhat by accident. He had worked on various American newspapers, chiefly *The Cleveland Press* and *The Indianapolis Star*, on which in six years he rose from reporter and copy reader to managing editor. He was still at that job when he had a breakdown in 1912. During a long trip to Europe recovering he learned *The Chicago Daily News* needed a Berlin correspondent. He got the job. It was 1913, he was only twenty-six, and he was sitting in the lap of history. He was in Germany when World War No. 1 broke, remained there until the United States entered hostilities.

IT was he—although he was never able to report a word of it in his dispatches—who carried a German peace offer which might have saved millions of lives by ending the conflict in the first months. The German armies had swept through Belgium; the great battle for Paris had ended in trenches and stalemate. Herr von Bethmann Hollweg, Imperial German Chancellor, sent the young American to London as his personal emissary.

"Tell Sir Edward Grey," he instructed, "that Germany will annex no Belgian territory and will guarantee Belgium's complete independence. But you must also tell him that in the peace Germany will want an indemnity for having been forced into the war."

Dutifully silent about the biggest piece of news he could have had, Swing journeyed to London and was received. At mention of an indemnity, however, Sir Edward's face turned livid and Swing was bowed out. To this day he mourns that he did not blurt out that the German Chancellor had perhaps included the indemnity demand only to protect himself in case the German military discovered him talking peace prematurely. "As I look back upon my mission, I admit that I myself may have been partly to blame for its failure." The thought still preys upon him.

After the war Swing went back to Berlin for *The New York Sun* and *The New York Herald*. He became so familiar with the German language that today, when Herr Hitler shouts his bad German into a microphone, Swing can give American listeners a running and perfect translation.

In 1922 Clarence Barron, publisher of *The Wall Street Journal*, sought him out. "You know German economics," said Barron. "I need you. What job do you want?" Answered Swing, "I'd like to be head of your European service." He held that place for two years and it gave him the sound economic training which enabled him later, in 1931, as London correspondent for *The Philadelphia Public Ledger* and *The New York Evening Post*, to predict that Britain would be forced off the gold standard. He reached his conclusion by sheer analysis of the British money market and economic position, and his American newspapers declined to print the story. The editors consulted financial and political leaders; none believed such a thing possible. Their dubious written reactions were mailed to Swing. The mail bag arrived in London on a Monday. Britain had deserted gold over the weekend.

Swing cites the episode as an example of what he is attempting today to do in radio. "I try," he says, "to clarify what is going on in the world.

I am not especially interested in prophecy. I try only to analyze. It is sometimes possible to prophesy by analysis. That is the only kind of prophecy I indulge in."

Some of his analytical prophecies have been downright disconcerting. On last April 9, discussing the "amazingly swift success of the Germans in establishing a puppet government at Oslo," he said: "That, you can be sure, wasn't improvised. Puppet governments can only be established out of political elements in another country after long intrigue." Not until days later did correspondents on the scene get through their stories about Nazi intrigue in Norway.

On May 8, discussing the 284 to 200 vote of confidence for Prime Minister Chamberlain, he said: "A vote of confidence is not a vote of confidence when the votes don't mean it. The real vote was 200 noes, 134 abstentions, a total of 334 against only 284 ayes. . . . Mr. Chamberlain's remarkable part in world history is quite near its end."

May 18, analyzing the removal of Daladier as French Minister of War: "It may even foreshadow a change in the command of the French army. If General Gamelin were to be displaced, Daladier would hardly be able to put it through. He is a Gamelin man."

Even more important is his ability to clear up the muddled foreign scene. For example on April 25, discussing the British debacle at Namsos, Norway, where troops with only machine guns were thrown into action against planes, tanks and artillery, he said: "This proves something else besides wasteful hurry. It proves that the British did not have any expeditionary force ready to invade Norway. The Germans, you will remember, said they had indisputable proof that the Allies were going to land in Norway."

On May 29, when Americans were wondering why General Weygand did not start the great counter-offensive to relieve the besieged Allied troops in Dunkirk: "A division of an army—foot and motorized—takes up from twelve to fourteen miles of road space. To move a division by train takes forty-nine to fifty-nine trains of thirty-four cars each. So there has been no time."

To Americans, fed during the last year on vigorous stuff like that, Swing's broadcasts to England and Canada will seem almost vapid. They have begun as casually as this one last summer: "It is summer. Schools have closed. The great railway stations in New York have been congested with persons off for their holidays." Even last March, with Europe's legions assembling for the showdown, he could meander thus: "The New York newspapers have paid the arrival of the *Queen Elizabeth* the tribute of most exhaustive reporting. But in the main we have been interested in our own affairs. There has been a storm over the prying questions of the census takers."

It surprises the visitor that Swing has managed thus to interpret America to Britain, and Europe to America (and to make newsreel interpretive shorts on the side), with much less equipment than would be found in a crossroad lawyer's office. In his cubbyhole overlooking Times Square in New York are a few scanty shelves of books, several maps on the walls. He has no research staff, only one secretary to answer mail and telephone. Until the Battle of France he did not even have a news ticker. He had to go up to the studio news room to learn the latest, which he did with the air of already knowing. He does not correspond with any inside sources in Europe. "What would be the use?" he asks. "I don't do inside stuff. Anyone who says he does is a liar. It takes three weeks for letters to and from Europe, and there is censorship. I must interpret tonight what happened this morning. If you have Europe as a living map inside your head you can usually figure things out. At least as well as some of the statesmen.

As he pounds out his 2,000 words a day on a portable typewriter he does check his own judgments with others—bank economists, shipping and importing officials, officers of such organizations as the Foreign Policy Association and the Council on Foreign Relations, often with the U.S. State Department. He consults with other commentators, especially with John Gunther, who has appeared periodically at the same hour as a direct rival on a National Broadcasting Company network.

It sounds elegantly easy, is in reality so hard that Swing has to turn down speaking engagements which would net him $500 to $1,000 for a mere hour of after-dinner twaddle. Literally, he doesn't have the time. He is in his office at 10 A.M., is never through before 10:30 at night. Each morning for about two hours he answers his fan mail. Luncheon is usually a professional appointment with several hours for discussion. Around 4 P.M. he settles down to analyze a world gone crazy. He starts writing about 6:30 P.M. and has his piece done some time after 8. He rehearses it, changes a word here and a line there, has a final look at the teletype machine and is on the studio floor fifteen minutes before broadcasting time.

Famous, he is the most unknown man in New York. Tourists ask the captains in the nightclubs to point him out. The captains would not know him from Adam. They have never seen him.

Mrs. Swing and three children (Swing has two others by a previous marriage) hold forth in a lovely country retreat at Easton, Connecticut. Swing can get out only on weekends. The rest of the time, a martyr to analysis, he must live in an apartment only three blocks from the microphone. There are always guests on weekends, but there is a standing rule that no one shall mention the state of the world. Swing refuses even to read newspapers on weekends. He prefers a bit of music, or a game of ping pong or a round of poker. He is terrific at the last. He has taught some of the wiliest diplomats that a card in the hole can be a liability as well as an asset.

But sometimes over a royal flush draw these weekends he looks a bit peaked. "The trouble," he explains, "is that America is scared. I'd like a little rest. From the look of things, I don't know when I can stop Swinging."

The Dark Messiah

A vivid vignette of rigorously regimented, pre-war Nazi Germany, drawn by a brilliant American novelist

THOMAS WOLFE

For its value as a word picture of a totalitarian state, CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM *presents the following. It appears in the late Mr. Wolfe's forthcoming book,* You Can't Go Home Again.

GEORGE had not been in Germany since 1928 and the early months of 1929. At that time he had stayed for a while in a little town in the Black Forest, and he remembered that there had been great excitement because an election was being held. The state of politics was chaotic, with a bewildering number of parties, and the Communists polled a surprisingly large vote. People were disturbed and anxious, and there seemed to be a sense of impending calamity in the air.

This time, things were different. Germany had changed.

Ever since 1933, when the change occurred, George had read, first with amazement, shock, and doubt, then with despair and a leaden sinking of the heart, all the newspaper accounts of what was going on in Germany. He found it hard to believe some of the reports. Of course, there were irresponsible extremists in Germany as elsewhere, and in times of crisis no doubt they got out of hand, but he thought he knew Germany and the German people, and on the whole he was inclined to feel that the true state of affairs had been exaggerated and that things simply could not be as bad as they were pictured.

And now, on the train from Paris, he met some Germans who gave him reassurance. They said there was no longer any confusion or chaos in politics and government, and no longer any fear among the people, because everyone was so happy. This was what George wanted desperately to believe, and he was prepared to be happy, too.

The month of May is wonderful everywhere. It was particularly wonderful in Berlin that year. Along the streets, in the Tiergarten, in all the great gardens, and along the Spree Canal the horse chestnut trees were in full bloom. The crowds sauntered underneath the trees on the Kurfuerstendamm, the terraces of the cafes were jammed with people, and always, through the golden sparkle of the days, there was a sound of music in the air. George saw the chains of endlessly lovely lakes around Berlin, and for the first time he knew the wonderful golden bronze upon the ll poles of the kiefern trees. Before, he had visited only the south of Germany, the Rhinelands and Bavaria; now the north seemed even more enchanting.

It was the season of the great Olympic games, and almost every day George went to the stadium in Berlin. George observed that the organizing genius of the German people, which has been used so often to such noble purpose, was now more thrillingly displayed than he had ever seen it before. The sheer pageantry of the occasion was overwhelming, so much so that he began to feel oppressed by it. There seemed to be something ominous in it. One sensed a stupendous concentration of effort, a tremendous drawing together and ordering in the vast collective power of the whole land. And the thing that made it seem ominous was that it so evidently went beyond what the games themselves demanded. The games were overshadowed, and were no longer merely sporting competitions to which other nations had sent their chosen teams. They became, day after day, an orderly and overwhelming demonstration in which the whole of Germany had been schooled and disciplined. It was as if the games had been chosen as a symbol of the new collective might, a means of showing to the world in concrete terms what this new power had come to be.

With no past experience in such affairs, the Germans had constructed a mighty stadium which was the most beautiful and most perfect in its design that had ever been built. And all the accessories of this monstrous plant—the swimming pools, the enormous halls, the lesser stadia—had been laid out and designed with this same cohesion of beauty and of use. The organization was superb. Not only were the events themselves, down to the minutest detail of each competition, staged and run off like clockwork, but the crowds—such crowds as no other great city has ever had to cope with, and the like of which would certainly have snarled and maddened the traffic of New York beyond hope of untangling—were handled with a quietness, order, and speed that was astounding.

The daily spectacle was breath-taking in its beauty and magnificence. The stadium was a tour-

nament of color that caught the throat; the massed splendor of the banners made the gaudy decorations of America's great parades, presidential inaugurations, and World's Fairs seem like shoddy carnivals in comparison. And for the duration of the Olympics, Berlin itself was transformed into a kind of annex to the stadium. From one end of the city to the other, from the Lustgarten to the Brandenburger Tor, along the whole broad sweep of Unter den Linden, through the vast avenues of the faery Tiergarten, and out through the western part of Berlin to the very portals of the stadium, the whole town was a thrilling pageantry of royal banners—not merely endless miles of looped-up bunting, but banners fifty feet in height, such as might have graced the battle tent of some great emperor.

And all through the day, from morning on, Berlin became a mighty Ear, attuned, attentive, focused on the stadium. Everywhere the air was filled with a single voice. The green trees along the Kurfuerstendamm began to talk: from loudspeakers concealed in their branches an announcer in the stadium spoke to the whole city—and for George Webber it was a strange experience to hear the familiar terms of track and field translated into the tongue that Goethe used. He would be informed now that the *Vorlauf* was about to be run—and then the *Zwischenlauf*—and at length the *Endlauf*—and the winner:

"Owens—Oo Ess Ah!"

Meanwhile, through those tremendous banner-laden ways, the crowds thronged ceaselessly all day long. The wide promenade of Unter den Linden was solid with patient, tramping German feet. Fathers, mothers, children, young folks, old—the whole material of the nation was there, from every corner of the land. From morn to night they trudged, wide-eyed, full of wonder, past the marvel of those banner-laden ways. And among them one saw the bright stabs of color of Olympic jackets and the glint of foreign faces: the dark features of Frenchmen and Italians, the ivory grimace of the Japanese, the straw hair and blue eyes of the Swedes, and the big Americans, natty in straw hats, white flannels, and blue coats crested with the Olympic seal.

And there were great displays of marching men, sometimes ungunned but rhythmic, as regiments of brown shirts went swinging through the streets. By noon each day all the main approaches to the games, the embannered streets and avenues of the route which the Leader would take to the stadium, miles away, were walled in by the troops. They stood at ease, young men, laughing and talking with each other—the Leader's bodyguards, the Schutz Staffel units, the Storm Troopers, all the ranks and divisions in their different uniforms—and they stretched in two unbroken lines from the Wilhelmstrasse up to the arches of the Brandenburger Tor. Then, suddenly, the sharp command, and instantly there would be the solid smack of ten thousand leather boots as they came together with the sound of war.

It seemed as if everything had been planned for this moment, shaped to this triumphant purpose. But the people—they had not been planned. Day after day, behind the unbroken wall of soldiers, they stood and waited in a dense and patient throng. These were the masses of the nation, the poor ones of the earth, the humble ones of life, the workers and the wives, the mothers and the children—and day after day they came and stood and waited. They were there because they did not have money enough to buy the little cardboard squares that would have given them places within the magic ring. From noon till night they waited for just two brief and golden moments of the day; the moment when the Leader went out to the stadium, and the moment when he returned.

At last he came—and something like a wind across a field of grass was shaken through that crowd, and from afar the tide rolled up with him, and in it was the voice, the hope, the prayer of the land. The Leader came by slowly in a shining car, a little dark man with a comic-opera mustache, erect and standing, moveless and unsmiling, with his hand upraised, palm outward, not in Nazi-wise salute, but straight up, in a gesture of blessing such as the Buddha or Messiahs use.

* * * * *

The first weeks passed, and George began to hear some ugly things. From time to time, at parties, dinners, and the like, when George would speak of his enthusiasm for Germany and the Ger-

man people, various friends that he had made would, if they had had enough to drink, take him aside afterwards and, after looking around cautiously, lean toward him with an air of great secrecy and whisper:

"But have you heard . . . ? And have you heard . . . ?"

He did not see any of the ugly things they whispered about. He did not see anyone beaten. He did not see anyone imprisoned, or put to death. He did not see any men in concentration camps. He did not see openly anywhere the physical manifestations of a brutal and compulsive force.

True, there were men in brown uniforms everywhere, and men in black uniforms, and men in uniforms of olive green, and everywhere in the streets there was the solid smack of booted feet, the blare of brass, the tootling of fifes, and the poignant sight of young faces shaded under iron helmets, with folded arms and ramrod backs, precisely seated in great army lorries. But all of this had become so mixed in with the genial temper of the people making holiday, as he had seen and known it so many pleasant times before, that even if it did not now seem good, it did not seem sinister or bad.

Then something happened. It didn't happen suddenly. It just happened as a cloud gathers, as fog settles, as rain begins to fall.

A man George had met was planning to give a party for him and asked him if he wanted to ask any of his friends. George mentioned one. His host was silent for a moment; he looked embarrassed; then he said that the person George had named had formerly been the editorial head of a publication that had been suppressed, and that one of the people who had been instrumental in its suppression had been invited to the party, so would George mind—?

George named another, an old friend named Franz Heilig whom he had first met in Munich years before, and who now lived in Berlin, and of whom he was very fond. Again the anxious pause, the embarrassment, the halting objections. This person was—was—well, George's host said he knew about this person and knew he did not go to parties—he would not come if he were invited—so would George mind—?

George next spoke of a lady named Else von Kohler, and the response to this suggestion was of the same kind. How long had he known this woman? Where, and under what circumstances, had he met her? George tried to reassure his host on all these scores. He told the man he need have no fear of any sort about Else. His host was instant, swift, in his apologies: oh, by no means—he was sure the lady was eminently all right—only, nowadays—with a mixed gathering—he had tried to pick a group of people whom George had met

and who all knew one another—he had thought it would be much more pleasant that way—strangers at a party were often shy, constrained, and formal—Frau von Kohler would not know anybody there—so would George mind—?

Not long after this baffling experience a friend came to see him. "In a few days," his friend said, "you will receive a phone call from a certain person. He will try to meet you, to talk to you. Have nothing to do with this man."

George laughed. His friend was a sober-minded German, rather on the dull and heavy side, and his face was so absurdly serious as he spoke that George thought he was trying to play some lumbering joke upon him. He wanted to know who this mysterious personage might be who was so anxious to make his acquaintance.

To George's amazement and incredulity, his friend named a high official in the government.

But why, George asked, should this man want to meet him? And why, if he did, should he be afraid of him?

At first his friend would not answer. Finally he muttered circumspectly:

"Listen to me. Stay away from this man. I tell you for your own good." He paused, not knowing how to say it; then: "You have heard of Captain Roehm? You know about him? You know what happened to him?" George nodded. "Well," his friend went on in a troubled voice, "there were others who were not shot in the purge. This man I speak of is one of the bad ones. We have a name for him—it is 'The Prince of Darkness.' "

George did not know what to make of all this. He tried to puzzle it out but could not, so at last he dismissed it from his mind. But within a few days the official whom his friend had named did telephone, and did ask to meet him. George offered some excuse and avoided seeing the man, but the

episode was most spectacular and very unsettling.

Both of these baffling experiences contained elements of comedy and melodrama, but those were the superficial aspects. George began to realize now the tragedy that lay behind such things. There was nothing political in any of it. The roots of it were much more sinister and deep and evil than politics or even racial prejudice could ever be. For the first time in his life he had come upon something full of horror that he had never known before—something that made all the swift violence and passion of America, the gangster compacts, the sudden killings, the harshness and corruption that infested portions of American business and public life, seem innocent beside it. What George began to see was a picture of a great people who had been psychically wounded and were now desperately ill with some dread malady of the soul. Here was an entire nation, he now realized, that was infested with the contagion of an ever-present fear. It was a kind of creeping paralysis which twisted and blighted all human relations. The pressures of a constant and infamous compulsion had silenced this whole people into a sweltering and malignant secrecy until they had become spiritually septic with the distillations of their own self-poisons, for which now there was no medicine or release.

So the weeks, the months, the summer passed, and everywhere about him George saw the evidences of this dissolution, this shipwreck of a great spirit. The poisonous emanations of suppression, persecution, and fear permeated the air like miasmic and pestilential vapors, tainting, sickening, and blighting the lives of everyone he met. It was a plague of the spirit—invisible, but as unmistakable as death. Little by little it sank in on him through all the golden singing of that summer, until at last he felt it, breathed it, lived it, and knew it for the thing it was.

Mobilizing U.S. Man Power

How this country is meeting the threat of total war with military and civil measures for national defense

ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE

In 1938, at the time of the Munich surrender to Germany, every country in the Western world—except two—trained its citizens to participate in national defense either as soldiers or workers. Those two exceptions were Great Britain and the United States.

On April 27, four months before war broke out, Britain too made military training compulsory, and the United States stood alone. When German troops in June 1940 smashed their way to most of Europe's Atlantic seaboard, the people of the United States, in sudden anxiety, took stock of their military establishment. It was then much as it had been for twenty years. It consisted of the world's second strongest navy and one of the world's smallest armies. In peace time it supplemented its strength by the voluntary services of patriotic citizens.

The scope and power of European warfare made these efforts seem inadequate. There is now little likelihood that the United States will long retain its unique position among nations. Before long for the first time in history, we shall probably make military training in peace time compulsory for American youth.

To defend itself, on domestic or foreign soil, America needs a fighting force equipped for totalitarian war. Primarily, the problem of American defense is one of mobilizing man power. Neither industry, now being geared to the needs of defense, nor the fighting forces themselves can hit the pace required by the present defense program without the mobilization of additional man power.

On the supply of labor at the disposal of the war industries, official figures are not published. But the present strength and the authorized strength of the fighting forces are public knowledge. The Navy's personnel consists of 156,500 officers and men; the planned strength is 182,000. For the Army corresponding figures are 242,648 and 375,000; for the Reserves 157,000 and 192,000; for the National Guard 245,500 and 251,000. Two thousand eight hundred fully trained pilots fly for the Army; 2,602 for the Navy. An increase to 7,000 is planned for the Army and with air cadets now in training the Navy will dispose of

16,000 flyers. The total effectives of all branches are 650,050 with approximately 100,000 planned and authorized additions. There are, furthermore, 300,000 graduates of Civilian Military Training Camps and 186,750 students had enrolled in last year's Reserve Officer Training Corps. Such is the inventory of U.S. man power under arms or available for service at short notice.

Measured by the standards of the great military powers of Europe, these figures are small. It is estimated that, at the end of September 1939, France and Germany each had 5,000,000 first line troops and trained reserves. Russia boasts of 13,000,000 regulars and reserves in a population only one third larger than that of the United States. Italy claims that she put 3,000,000 fully trained and equipped troops in the field on June 10 when she went to war against France and Britain.

The forces of the United States seem especially small in view of the vast areas in which they must operate. Just what these areas may prove to be is still uncertain. But General George C. Marshall's recent suggestion of a 100,000-man increase in the Army's enlisted strength took into consideration the requirements for (1) garrisoning outlying bases in the Caribbean and the Pacific, (2) dispatching an expeditionary force in case of invasion from abroad and "fifth column" troubles anywhere in this hemisphere and (3) repelling enemy attempts at landing on U.S. soil. The U.S. Navy and its air force would have something forceful to say about such attempts. But General Marshall's proposal of nine modern infantry divisions, one cavalry and one mechanized division provide a field force sufficiently strong to deal with whatever force another power could transport across either ocean today.

"Today"—but what of tomorrow? It is up to the fighting services to envisage all possible combinations of hostile powers and all possible emergencies. After the Allies' reverses in the Lowlands, many theretofore improbable situations won the attention of matter-of-fact American defense experts.

At this moment, the South American nations can put no more than 300,000 first line troops in the field. And their combined naval forces consist of three aging battleships, three new cruisers, about thirty destroyers and twenty submarines—no match for any of the world's great naval powers. The equipment of their air and land forces is second-best, which in combat against superior equipment proves of next to no use at all. A cool analysis of hemisphere strategy indicates that responsibility for the defense of the whole American hemisphere may rest squarely on the United States.

The President's request for authority to order the National Guard into federal service during a recess of Congress drew attention to the role the militia must play in home defense and in strengthening an expeditionary force. Not even General Marshall's proposed increases will enable the regular Army to man the anti-aircraft defenses

of the continental United States. It has been suggested, therefore, that certain National Guard regiments be transformed into anti-aircraft regiments, relieving the regular Army of the job of providing anti-aircraft protection for towns and factories. English territorials with "militia" training apparently make good crews for anti-aircraft batteries fool-proofed by mechanical fire direction.

HAND in hand with the proposal for an increase of the National Guard goes one for its reorganization. The National Guard is an army of citizen-soldiers and thus the closest approximation of the people's armies abroad. It was originally created for the home defense of individual states, but its main function, during the first World War, was to supply effectives for service with the regular Army. The airplane's challenge to American security now revives the National Guard's function of home defense.

At present the National Guard consists of eighteen infantry divisions, one cavalry division, seven cavalry brigades, several separate infantry regiments, field and coast artillery regiments, anti-aircraft regiments and auxiliary units. It has no armored units or modern anti-tank guns. Its anti-aircraft and heavy artillery equipment is scanty. The Guardsmen drill a few hours each week and participate in a short period of Army exercises each year.

The proposal to integrate a part of the National Guard into a field force with mechanized equipment, and to create a separate home defense force of coastal defense and anti-aircraft units, adapts the "better aspects of British preparedness," according to Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert of *The New York Times*. He urges that the National Guard be regrouped as well as re-equipped and re-enforced. Upon the outbreak of war it could add its field force to the regular Army and simultaneously relieve the Army of home defense duties, as the Territorials, England's militia, have done. The older men, drawn from the local population, could be used for anti-aircraft and coastal defenses.

In peace time, the National Guard's Com-

manders-in-Chief are the Governors of the states. The state organizes the various units, selects their officers, provides armories and storage facilities. The federal government pays men and officers, assigns instructors and issues the necessary equipment. The President may call the National Guard without special authority from Congress for duty in local emergencies—for example, in floods or earthquakes. But only with the authority of Congress, which must declare that there exists a *national* emergency, may he "order," as opposed to "call," the National Guard into service.

Reorganization of the National Guard on a nation-wide basis may therefore have to wait upon the approval of Congress.

Fortunately, the expansion of both regular Army and National Guard will not be impeded by too few officers. When the United States entered the first World War the reserve of officers totaled 2,900. Today it is 103,000. To Reserve Officer Training Corps training in colleges, academies and high schools must be given the credit for the increase.

ACCORDING to a recent survey 186,750 men enrolled for R.O.T.C. training in the academic year ending June 1940. Every twelfth university and college offers military training. Most of the enrollees take the basic two year course, but roughly 5 per cent are graduated from the four year course qualifying them for reserve officer commissions. About half of the 136 colleges and universities having R.O.T.C. training make it a required subject for the first two years, an elective subject for the last two. In the others it is on a voluntary basis.

The R.O.T.C. is directed by officers of the regular Army who as professors of Military Science and Tactics join the teaching staff of the university or college. The cadet is given instruction in rifle marksmanship, scouting and patrolling, map reading and so on. A six weeks' training period at the end of the third year provides experience in the field.

During the academic year ending last June, 70,441 youths at 138 public and private secondary schools and 42 military academies received junior R.O.T.C. training under United States Army officers. The scope of this training ranges from courses in military organization and first aid to instruction in military history. While junior R.O.T.C. training is pre-military and stresses the virtues of orderliness and loyalty, its secondary objective is to lay the foundation for further military instruction.

Despite widespread distrust of "boy-militarism" in many circles, both junior and senior R.O.T.C. have grown steadily since the first World War, showing an increase of 20 per cent in the past two years.

The size of today's reserve of officers is a manifest improvement over 1917. Yet some observers

hold that the instruction of reserve officers by correspondence courses and a two weeks' annual service period in summer does not afford that intensive training required by the complex methods of modern warfare.

And some experts feel that all these measures, good enough as far as they go, still fail to solve the problem of how to mobilize American man power. Impressed by Europe's examples of democratic fumbling and totalitarian efficiency, they believe that the solution cannot be found in volunteers. Forthrightly, they advocate a national system of compulsory military training. For only a law requiring each citizen to take his place in his country's organization for war is equitable to all and, therefore, truly democratic. Only universal service allowing for orderly mobilization and training assures national teamwork and meets the totalitarian challenge.

PERHAPS no other organization has done more to publicize proposals for universal service than the Military Training Camps Association of the United States, originators of the preparedness movement known in 1915 as the "Plattsburg Idea." This civilian organization, which trained 65,000 line officers for the first World War, returned to the spotlight in mid-May, 1940, not long after Hitler invaded the Lowlands. A National Emergency Council was set up under the chairmanship of Grenville Clark, a New York attorney and one of the founders of the movement twenty-five years ago. A few weeks ago it published a report which found:

(a) That merely to bring the regular Army and National Guard up to their maximum authorized strength would require 286,000 enlistments; and

(b) That it would require certainly not less than 500,000 more enlistments to service and operate the 50,000 planes recommended by the President.

It concluded that no such number can be obtained in peace time by voluntary enlistment, and that voluntary recruiting, to obtain the needed three-quarters of a million men, is unfair and undemocratic. Consequently, it recommended "prompt enactment of a statute by Congress requiring general compulsory military training."

It also asked the War Department to establish businessmen's military training camps—based on the original Plattsburg Idea. The Secretary of War approved this proposal, leading to the establishment of Citizens' Military Training Camps for business and professional men. An avalanche of applications far exceeded the training facilities provided under this plan, designed to give rudimentary military training to educated men between twenty-five and fifty.

Among the many prominent supporters of proposals advanced by the Military Training Camps Association were Colonel Frank Knox and Colonel Henry L. Stimson, both ardent champions of compulsory military training, who on June 21 were named Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War, respectively.

THE President's proposal for "Government Training," transmitted to the public on June 18, adopted the principles of universal military training. His observation, however, that for every combat soldier there must be another behind the lines performing some vital task recognizes the all-inclusiveness of modern war. The President prescribed several categories of compulsory service: combat service; supply and aviation mechanical service; employment in munitions, airplane, clothing and other essential industries; conservation work of various kinds.

He made it clear that he would not stop with compulsory military training. He would also draft young men for apprentice service as mechanics, as employees in industrial plants and as conservation workers, similar to the enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The President offered the C.C.C. as an example of what he contemplated. The C.C.C. now operates on a voluntary basis. Its training has helped graduates in finding jobs in industry. Compulsory training camps as envisioned by the President would prepare young men similarly. They would promote self-reliance, discipline, and devotion to duty. In addition, they would give the country a large group trained for essential tasks of national defense.

It has been objected that the President's proposals might be whittled down to making the C.C.C. an experimental agency for the military training of youth, but that this would be unfair and undemocratic since the C.C.C. boys are the economically underprivileged.

The same objection is made against using the National Youth Administration for training defense workers. The N.Y.A., at present, trains 280,000 boys and girls in more than 100 different professional and industrial occupations and it is planned to add 446,000 to this number. Among subjects taught in N.Y.A. camps and workshops are aero-dynamics, machine shop operations, and X-ray technique. Most of these crafts and skills can be employed in defense work. N.Y.A. vocational training helps to overcome such bottlenecks in the arms industry as the shortage of skilled workers for aviation plants.

Another government agency, the U.S. Office of Education, conducts vocational training in 1,080 schools and annually turns out 500,000 skilled lathe operators, machinists, motor me-

chanics and so on. Probably this number could be doubled if necessary. Yet there is a serious obstacle in the shortage of machine tools to stepping-up the government's program for vocational training in the arms and aviation trades.

THE President's figure of 50,000 fighting planes calls for pilot training far surpassing the Army's and the Navy's school facilities. The Civil Aeronautics Authority has been granted a $37,000,000 appropriation for the training of 45,000 persons in primary flying and for the further training of 9,000 in a secondary course. In view of the urgent need for an increased air force, the C.A.A. will play a star role in whatever project may emerge for mobilizing youth.

The nuclei of a national organization for defense training exist. A plan to coordinate them in a system of universal and compulsory service has not, as yet, been perfected.

The President, having tossed into public discussion the idea of compulsory government training of 2,000,000 youths each year, named Sidney Hillman, labor leader, to draft a set of plans. Mr. Hillman and his collaborators will be aided by the experience gained from the selective service law in the first World War. Under that measure thousands of local and district boards were set up which, through questionnaires to men of conscript age, obtained the information necessary for the selection of conscripts.

The greatest advantage of conscription by a selective system is that it causes the minimum disturbance to the national economy, and that, unlike a volunteer system, it does not draw into the armed services young men who would be more useful if they remained at the turret lathes, drafting boards or executive posts of vital industries.

A selective procedure, furthermore, avoids swamping available training facilities. The Army, with its officers and physical installations, can absorb 50,000 recruits a month. Available instructors, housing accommodations and machine tools also set limits to the number of youths who can be efficiently schooled by the government's various three-letter agencies. Statisticians figure that the number of young men from eighteen to twenty-nine who might be fitted into a program of compulsory service is 14,000,000. If only 30 per cent were found fit and were called for one year's military training, the Army's training facilities would have to be increased ten-fold—and that is not deemed practical by even the most ardent champions of preparedness.

Most European nations have enacted compulsory service laws under which young men are liable for two or three years of military service and as reservists for additional periods. This system cannot be improvised on short notice. A plan resembling the Selective Service Bill of 1917, and utilizing existing voluntary organizations, appears to offer the best prospects in the United States.

Government service—or whatever compulsory service in peace time is to be called—is a measure to be applied cautiously and with due regard to cushioning its impact upon the civilian scheme of things. To introduce it in times of domestic prosperity and international quiet would still require care; to graft it on the body politic in times of economic stress at home and political chaos abroad requires a cool head and a sure hand. Drafting the nation's youth for war must not serve as an expedient for curing surreptitiously such economic ills as unemployment.

By the same token, the mobilization of man power for defense must rely on moral reserves not less than on reserves of men. If the spirit of service does not animate drafted youth, the dangers of regimentation will out-weigh purely military advantages. Without the cheerful shouldering of the duties which go with good citizenship, government service will be another name for drab drudgery. The plans now on the government's drafting board must count on the release of those moral forces which have carried the Republic triumphantly through its historic struggles, if American citizens are to be drafted for the purpose of defense and and are still able to remain free men.

Machine Tools for Defense

The machines that make the machines will be ready as they are needed for our country's arms program

CLIFFORD S. STILWELL

THE machine tool industry is one of the oldest industries in the United States. And yet, *until the national defense* emergency of the past few months, the majority of the people of this country probably had never heard of it. Only when the vital connection between machine tools and military preparedness became front-page news did everyone become aware of the industry's existence.

This is not surprising. Machine tools are not consumers' goods. They are producers' goods. Machine tools are not used by the public. They are used by manufacturers. In the whole United States you will never find a machine tool in a home or a public place. You will find the country's machine tools only on factory floors, where most people never see them.

Machine tools are the machines that make the machines. They help to make radios, telephones, automobiles, electric refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and thousands of other devices used in American homes. They help to make presses, textile equipment, steel mill equipment, railroad equipment, oil field machinery, airplane engines, and thousands of other devices used in industry and transportation. Furthermore, it takes machine tools to make machine tools! They are the only machines which are literally capable of reproducing themselves.

The fact is that practically every mechanical device known to mankind requires machine tools, in one way or another, for its manufacture. Without machine tools, mass production, as we know it today—with interchangeability of parts, and with reductions in costs which constantly bring new conveniences within the reach of hundreds of thousands of new pocketbooks—would be impossible. And without mass production, today's large-scale employment would be impossible.

Machine tools are the means by which modern industry turns raw metal into the functioning parts of the machines and devices which today perform a major share of the work of American factories and American homes.

A machine tool may be simply defined as a power-driven machine used to cut or shape metal. Metal may be cut or shaped by milling, planing, turning, boring, or grinding. These arts give their names to the five major classifications of machine tools. In the days before our modern industrial civilization, all of these things were done by hand tools. Then someone found out how to apply power to these simple tools. With the application of power these tools became not only tools but machines. Hence the term "machine tools".

The jobs performed by machine tools may be compared to the jobs done by a carpenter. Suppose a carpenter is making a leg for a chair. He takes a piece of wood and by the use of a chisel or a power-driven lathe removes enough of the wood to bring the piece to the desired shape. Suppose a carpenter is making a seat for a chair. He takes a piece of wood and saws and planes away enough wood to bring the piece to the desired shape. In the course of putting the chair together, he drills holes so that the joints may fit together—thereby removing wood in order to make possible proper adjustment between parts. And when he is all through, he may sandpaper all of the parts, thereby removing still more wood in order to get the final finish.

With wood, these things can be done by hand. But with metal—especially with the type of steels required for radios, telephones and automobiles, or for oil wells, aircraft engines, and hydraulic presses—this sort of work cannot be done by hand. The steels are too tough and the accuracy required is too extreme. This work can only be done satisfactorily by power-driven tools—in other words, machine tools.

In peace time, when the world goes along on a reasonably even keel, there is no particular excitement over machine tools. The public may not know just what machine tools are, but manufacturers do. They know they must have good machine tools in order to produce economically and meet competition. They buy machine tools to cut costs and increase accuracy and quality of product.

Now suddenly there has arrived the major problem of preparation for national defense. The whole industrial system of the United States is going to be pushed to capacity to meet this emergency.

Every manufacturer who has facilities which will enable him to turn out war and defense equipment will be put to work. And in order to produce what he is expected to produce, in the quantities and within the time desired, he will need more machine tools.

There is nothing surprising about this situation. Machine tools have long been needed for the manufacture of practically every mechanical device known to civilization. It is therefore not in the least surprising that machine tools will be equally needed for the manufacture of airplanes, anti-aircraft guns, tanks, rifles, munitions, and all the devices of national defense. Just as, in peace-time, machine tools cut the cost and increase the quality and accuracy of the machines which industry and the public use for normal purposes, so in this period of national defense machine tools will likewise cut the cost and improve the quality and accuracy of practically every single item we need.

To newspaper men, who have suddenly discovered the machine tool, this situation may naturally assume the proportions of a national emergency. But to machine tool manufacturers it represents simply an expansion and amplification of exactly the same job which they have been doing for American industry for the last hundred years.

Making machine tools for national defense is little different from making machine tools for the normal peace-time industrial needs of the United States. No broad "change-over" is required. It is true that in some respects machine tool requirements for national defense differ from machine tool requirements for normal peace-time industrial production. But the difference has to do chiefly with type and size of machine tools. The same production facilities which the machine tool industry has used to turn out machine tools for the manufacture of home conveniences and industrial equipment are equally applicable to the production of machine tools for national defense.

Production of items such as anti-aircraft guns, airplane engines and tanks requires the utmost accuracy. Today's machine tools possess that accuracy. It has been developed because of the growing need of America's peace-time industries for absolute accuracy and quality.

Production of items such as shells requires maximum efficiency on a mass-production basis. The operation of the competitive principle in American industry has long since led to the development of machine tools capable of exactly that type of efficiency.

In short, the problem with respect to machine tools for national defense is purely one of production. The question is, can the machine tool builders of the United States produce machine tools of the type required rapidly enough, and in sufficient quantities, to meet the added production demands imposed upon American industry by our national defense emergency? Those of us within the machine tool industry believe firmly that the making of machine tools for national defense, within the times and in the quantities required, will not present a major problem to the machine tool industry.

The machine tool industry has already had what might be termed a "dress rehearsal" with respect to increased production for defense purposes. Early last fall, when war broke out in Europe, on top of an already large demand for machine tools from domestic industries there was superimposed a tremendous demand for machine tools for defense purposes in England and France. No sooner had the industry geared up for this added production when there developed a still further call for machine tools in very large quantities from United States builders of airplane engines and aircraft for delivery to the Allies.

THE machine tool industry has for months been expanding its productive capacity. Machine tool builders have bought large quantities of new machines and equipment. Many of them have put their plants upon a three-shift basis. They have farmed out parts-making wherever possible. In addition, many companies have inaugurated substantial plant expansions.

Much has been said in newspapers and magazines, in recent months, about the shortage of trained men. In my opinion there is not now, and will not be, any serious shortage of trained men within the machine tool industry. Our industry has been training large numbers of new men for well-nigh the past year—and we are continuing to take new men into the industry at an unprecedented rate. We have endeavored to make sure that we would have enough trained manpower to take care of whatever demands might be made upon us.

In view of all these circumstances, the sudden call for expanded machine tool production for national defense has meant simply a further con-

tinuation of the program of increased production, facilities, and trained personnel, which had already been in operation within the industry for many months.

Furthermore, a great deal of planning and scheduling still remains to be done before machine tool needs can be translated into actual orders for production. Of course the United States re-armament program will create a tremendous demand for machine tools. But what type of machine tools? In what quantities? And for what delivery dates? The answers to these questions cannot be made until the Army and the Navy have decided what type of equipment they need, in what quantities, and at what delivery dates.

JUST what does this country require for national defense? How many planes, and of what type? How many anti-aircraft guns, and of what type? How many tanks, and of what type? How many ships, and of what type? These are questions which simply cannot be answered offhand. The re-armament program is a vast undertaking. It involves not only billions of dollars but billions of details. It would be fatal if undue haste resulted in mistakes. It is essential that problems be thought through carefully in advance.

And until this sort of careful planning by the Army and Navy has been done—until there has been determined just what type of defense equipment is needed, in what quantities, and on what delivery dates—there can be no definite indication as to just what type of machine tool equipment will be needed by the manufacturers of these various items, or quantities of production and dates of delivery.

Fortunately the industry anticipates a reasonably early answer to these questions. There has been set up in Washington a Machine Tool Co-ordinating Committee, of which Mr. Knudsen, of the government's Advisory Defense Committee, is chairman. It is expected that through this committee the Army and the Navy will shortly present to the machine tool industry practical working details as to national defense machine tool requirements. The committee will then determine priorities of manufacture and delivery, and thus schedules of performance may be set up.

Of course only a small portion of the machine tools required for national defense will actually be ordered and purchased by the government. The larger share will go to manufacturers of airplane engines and airplanes, tanks, trucks, precision equipment, guns, ammunition, and so on. The job of the Co-ordinating Committee will be to determine the specific needs of these respective manufacturers and allocate machine tool output in such a way that it will help to maintain defense production on an evenly balanced basis all along the line.

The machine tool industry is confident that it will be able to supply machine tools to all of the manufacturers, and government arsenals, which will need them for the national defense program, just as rapidly as actual production schedules for specific defense items materialize.

This is by no means simply a matter of "good business" as far as the country's machine tool builders are concerned. All of us who went through the experiences of the last war know that "war business" is not good business. For us, the aftermath of the last war was well-nigh ruinous. When peace was declared, the world was flooded with excess machine tools—and for years plants the world over filled their machine tool needs from this second-hand war market instead of buying new machine tools. Seventy-five of the country's machine tool companies folded up for good. Those who survived have not forgotten those long lean years and the price inevitably to be paid for "war business." And the specter of a similar post-war flooded market faces us today. But we cannot think about that. Not now.

Today there is a job to be done. In order to carry through its re-armament program, the United States needs vast quantities of new machine tools. Our job is to produce those machine tools. As business men, we cannot help worrying about what the situation may be after the war is over. But as citizens of these United States there is only one answer. We must turn out more machine tools, and still more machine tools, *today*. This is the 1940 program of the machine tool industry.

Japan's New Premier

Led by Prince Konoye, link between the Army and Business, it will launch a new era of aggression

MARK GAYN

JAPAN'S Man of the Hour is Prince Fumimaro Konoye, a handsome, soft-spoken, astute statesman, who claims descent from gods and yearns to be his nation's Mussolini.

A few weeks ago, Konoye, head of a new totalitarian party formed to guide Japan along the path hewn by Germany and Italy, was named Premier with the warm approval and support of the Japanese Army and Navy.

For Konoye, the appointment was a personal triumph. For Japan, it is a political landmark, as significant as the Meiji "revolution" of seventy years ago. Emperor Meiji ushered Japan into industrial capitalism. Prince Konoye heralds the arrival of a new era which, for want of a better name, must be described as totalitarianism.

To an extent, the transition has its roots in the exhausting, stalemated war with China. Partly, it echoes Herr Hitler's spectacular victories over democratic institutions and arms. The events in Europe, in the belief of Japan's Army leaders, have given her a "golden opportunity." If Japan is to attain her ambitious imperial ends, she must strike now and strike hard. In this hour of destiny, the nation's leader must be a man who not only knows where to find his opportunity, but also how to unite his countrymen for new ventures.

Konoye is the man.

Beneath this broad outline lies a story of Machiavellian intrigue, of moves and counter-moves, of a bitter struggle for control of Japan and her imperial course. To understand why this is so, one must travel to Okitsu, a little town not far from Tokyo. There, in a modest villa, lives a bent, shrivelled little man, who has spanned the Meiji and Konoye "revolutions" and whose name is Prince Kimmochi Saionji.

Saionji is 91. Sixty years ago, fresh from study in Paris, he took the lead in the popular demand for parliamentary government. From radicalism he later veered to moderation, became a *Genro*—an "Elder Statesman"—and twice, in 1906 and 1911, served as Premier. With the death of other *Genro*, Saionji became the sole adviser of successive Emperors. His influence grew with age and infirmity. Between 1900 and 1930, no Premier gained appointment in Japan without his recommendation. No major move was made by the Court or Government without his approval.

When the Japanese Army struck in Manchuria, Saionji became the champion of liberalism and moderation. As one of the creators of parliamentary government in Japan, he was its jealous defender. As a confirmed believer in enlightened capitalism, he opposed military adventures abroad.

One after another, men of the Saionji school of thought were struck down by patriotic assassins. In the Army mutiny of 1936, the rebels went to Okitsu for Saionji's scalp, but failed to find him. Jingoist psychosis, rooted in the invasion of China, infected the populace, made it difficult and dangerous for aged Saionji to buck the tide. But Saionji's adherents still held key posts at the Court. When, around 1937, Army opposition made it inexpedient to seek Saionji's advice on the premiership, the Emperor turned to the two or three highest Court officials. Saionji's influence thus remained paramount.

But Saionji will not live long. Both he and Japan's alarmed super-trusts realize that with his death the moderates at the Court would be quickly replaced by jingoists. In 1936, the mutineers did not hesitate to murder Admiral Saito, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, wound Admiral Suzuki, Grand Chamberlain. Even earlier, other Court officials found it necessary to resign under Army pressure. How much easier it would be to dispense with the smaller Court fry of 1940.

The moderates set their minds to work. It was necessary to find a solution which would placate the Army, hold the jingoists in check, and assure the moderates of continued control over the Government and Court. Prince Konoye took part in these deliberations. He supplied the solution.

When Konoye was a student at the Kyoto Imperial University, he called on Prince Saionji to seek guidance. Squatting on the *tatami*, he expounded his thoughts and plans, asked for advice. Saionji stared at the youth, mumbled courteous "Your Excellency," offered no help. Konoye was puzzled and disappointed. The Konoye and Saionji families were closely related. Young Konoye's father had long served as President of the House

of Peers, worked in intimate contact with the *Genro*.

Many years later, Konoye said:

> I was melancholy and perplexed about my future. I read Tolstoy and felt oppressed by the injustice of the world. . . . As a result of his political activities, my father had fallen deeply in debt. While he was active our home was filled with his supporters and my boyish vanity was flattered. After he passed away, they ceased to come. Creditors pressed us for payment. For the first time, I knew what chilly winds blow in this world of ours and I became discontented and spiteful.

The Konoye family prides itself on being, next to the Emperor, the first family of Japan. Like the Emperor, they trace their descent from the gods who came to Nippon in time immemorial, to establish the Japanese race and make it great. Many monarchs sought their brides in the illustrious house of Fujiwara, of which the Konoye family is the mainstay. For the pride of a Konoye the position of a hounded debtor must have been unbearable.

Young Konoye thus became—as did Saionji thirty years before him—a radical. He even transferred from Kyoto to the Tokyo Imperial University, to attend the lectures of Dr. Kawakami, Japan's leading Marxist (since jailed). Somewhere in the back of his mind, however, Konoye kept a few reservations. While other "pinks" read Karl Marx, Konoye became first baseman on the University nine, a good sprinter. He also managed to acquire a firm belief in State Socialism. Twenty years later, he found it easy to shift to Mussolini's corporate state.

KONOYE was graduated with distinction in law, political science and philosophy. Once again he turned to Saionji, and this time met with a warmer reception. To the *Genro*, the youth propounded a strange plan of renouncing his title and going to the United States to study and work. In Japan, young talent—especially princely—is not allowed to waste. Saionji dissuaded Konoye, took the youth with him, as his secretary, to the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. From France, Konoye returned maturer, more conservative. Under Saionji's protective eye, he took his seat in the House of Peers. In 1931, at the age of 40, he became Vice-President of the House. Two years later, he became its head.

When in 1934 Konoye visited the United States, he was already regarded as Japan's outstanding statesman, head and shoulders above the usual run of civilian and military politicians from whose ranks rise the country's premiers. His undoubted flair for political compromise, his princely descent, even his physical stature—he is just shy of six feet—invited general respect.

At this time, Konoye was yet too young to become a member of the Court group, but old enough to be the most active of Saionji's "bright young men." Every crisis—Japan had many of them after the invasion of Manchuria—found his name on the list of "dark horses." But each offer of the premiership was politely declined. In Japan age counts for much, and Konoye felt he was too young. Besides, the Presidency of the House of Peers was too good a sinecure to give up for the uncertainty and peril of a premiership.

HIS political philosophy still had wide gaps. From his youthful days, he brought snatches of Marxism. From his association with practical politics and Big Business, he gained a healthy regard for capitalism and its rewards. The fighting services and the press they controlled brought to him an increasing awareness of totalitarian ideas.

One of Prince Konoye's new posts was the presidency of the *Toa Dobun-kai*, or East Asian Common Language Cultural Society, which sought to advance Japan's imperial ends through cultural propaganda. At the society's Moorish-like headquarters in Tokyo, Konoye began to meet bold, articulate and jingoist young men—professors, politicians, Army officers, journalists. With these men, Konoye struck a strange friendship. He welcomed their company and listened avidly, but spoke little.

It was in such groups—Konoye's *Toa Dobun-kai*, Baron Hiranuma's *Kokuhon-sha* and others—that Japan's political philosophy and policies were being moulded. All thoroughly dominated by imperialist ideology, these cliques were always a step ahead of Japan's aggression. The *Toa Dobun-kai* gave Konoye an understanding of imperialism, a respect for the Army, a host of military cronies.

"The Army," he once said, "is drawn from the whole manhood of the nation and is very close to

the people. It would be quite impossible, according to the Japanese idea, that so large a part of the national family should not have an influence in our affairs. The Navy has as much honor as the Army and is as important to our safety, but by the nature

of its duties it is not so close to the people and their domestic problems.

"How could the Army be indifferent to farmers' difficulties when it is largely composed of farmers' sons? . . . Our friends abroad need not fear a military dictatorship simply because the Army is deeply concerned with the state of the nation. The Army respects the Constitution. And the central principle on which the Japanese Constitution is framed is the co-operation of all classes and elements in the nation under the supreme authority of the Emperor."

But if, in a statement such as this, Konoye could sound like a spokesman of the military, he also remained Big Business' ablest representative. His contacts with the super-trusts, with the Court moderates, and—most of all—with Saionji, remained intimate. Together with them he nursed a distrust of a military dictatorship, a belief that imperialism needed its reins as well as its spurs.

In June, 1937, Prince Konoye became Premier. Although he was still reluctant to enter the political free-for-all, the pressure of various groups could no longer be resisted. The Army and Big Business regarded him equally as acceptable. His talent for keeping to the middle of the road without offending anyone had reached its full bloom.

By this time, the mutiny of 1936 was a year-old headline, but the storm it aroused continued to rage. The captains who led the revolt had been shot. The generals who inspired it were still pulling the wires behind the scenes, to the dismay of the moderates. The Army was preparing to deliver its blow in North China. National unity was essential. Moreover, the Army's "brain trust" was drafting plans for the nation's regimentation, and bitter press and parliamentary opposition was certain. The Army thought Konoye alone could push through its program. With equal confidence, Big Business felt he alone could check the Army.

As it happened, each was a little wrong.

Prince Konoye sanctioned the Chinese adventure, approved the Army's immense rearmament program, forced the National Mobilization Bill through the reluctant Diet. But in bowing to the Army's will, he managed in each case to salvage a little of the old economic *laissez-faire*, of parliamentary government.

In his maiden speech before the Diet, he described his motto as: "Heal Strife and Allay Friction." Few were impressed. Even his own Princeton-educated, golf-playing son, who listened to the address from the press benches, declared: "It may be impolite to say so, but father's speech failed to impress me. I expected more of him. Especially so since his address was discussed and polished by the Cabinet." It was realized only much later that Konoye had actually lived up to his motto.

And thus, in April, 1938, when a political crisis shook the Cabinet and led to rumors of Konoye's resignation, a Tokyo newspaper carried this "obituary":

> Prince Konoye has led the nation through a critical period . . . His leadership which, in the early days of his Cabinet, seemed not to be a dominant one, gradually asserted itself, and there can be no doubt that it was his personal influence that enabled the Government to obtain the passage of the important National Mobilization Bill through the Diet. His continued popularity in all circles was amply demonstrated at that time and it was made manifestly plain that the nation reposes great confidence in him. To find another leader with the same attributes for the premiership presents a most difficult problem . . .
>
> The political trend in this country is apparent to all and the question which arises at this junction is whether Premier Konoye is minded to lead the nation further along the path it seems to have embarked upon. The Premier made it plain, by repeated utterances in the last Diet session, that he is a firm supporter of the present constitutional system of Government and it may well be that he is unwilling to lead the nation towards an experiment of the type which is being urged in various quarters and which seems to be gaining in popularity in conjunction with the increasing stress which is being placed on the pact with Germany and Italy as a basis of foreign policy.
>
> It has been hinted that Premier Konoye would like to retire because of ill health . . . but is it not much more likely that if he should retire, it would be rather because the prin-

ciples for which he stands can no longer be conciliated with the policies which are being urged upon him?

Prince Konoye weathered this storm. But in the Fall of 1938 the Army presented a new series of demands. Among them were: sole control over the administration of invaded China, closer links with the Rome-Berlin Axis, and invocation of Article XI of the National Mobilization Bill, restricting dividend rates and the utilization of profits.

THIS, Konoye could not stand. He stomached the jingoist antics of General Araki and Admiral Suetsugu in his Cabinet. He half-heartedly approved the Army's seizure of the omnipotent Asia Development Board. But state control over earnings of the super-trusts he refused to sanction.

Events came fast. Early in December, Prince Konoye announced he would enunciate the Government's policies in a speech to be delivered in Osaka on December 11. The address was known to be inconsistent with the Army's views. A few hours before the appointed time, Konoye unaccountably fell ill. Despite the sickness, military leaders made a bee line for his residence. On December 22, Konoye recovered enough to deliver a vague, emasculated version of his original speech.

Immediately thereafter, he began to look for a successor. On January 3, 1939, Konoye handed the premiership over to Baron Hiranuma, whose chief virtues were archery and punctuality and whose drawbacks were his close affiliations with the Army, the ultra-reactionary organizations and Mitsuru Toyama, the "Grand Old Man" of Japanese political terrorism.

Konoye, however, remained in the limelight. Appointed President of the all-important Privy Council, he became a member of the Court triumvirate which was gradually succeeding Saionji as the "Maker of Premiers." In this high post, Konoye fought bitterly against a military alliance with the Rome-Berlin Axis, demanded by the Army just prior to the Hitler-Stalin accord. Just as bitterly he opposed new disputes with the democracies.

In this role he might have remained long, had not Herr Hitler triumphed in Europe. The initial German victories had a tremendous impact upon Japan. They whetted the Army's appetite for new conquests, gave a boost to domestic jingoism, strengthened the demand for a rigid regimentation of national life. With its back to the wall, Big Business once again turned to Prince Konoye for aid. The Army's drive towards military dictatorship had to be halted before it was too late. Saionji could no longer help, but in a proper setting, Konoye could succeed the aged *Genro* as the apostle of moderation and capitalism.

The first move was the revival of the old, dust- [illegible] originally proposed by the Army, for the creation of a single party. The Army hoped to keep such a party under its thumb, make it an instrument of military domination.

Next came Konoye's unexpected resignation from the presidency of the Privy Council. Another member of the Court triumvirate, the Lord Privy Seal, resigned a few days earlier. Both posts were given to Konoye's political henchmen.

Every channel of public opinion controlled by Big Business was employed to "build up" Konoye and the purpose of the campaign, shrouded in pious verbiage, was to create a one-man dictatorship, friendly to Big Business and depending for its strength upon its access to the Emperor, its control of the single party and its influence at the Court. Prince Konoye, the middle-of-the-roader unexcelled, is an ideal man for the job, for the new party itself essentially represents a compromise between the Army and Big Business.

THE Allied defeat in Europe has created conditions under which the moderates in Japan can no longer resist the demand for new Pacific conquests. Hongkong, Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies, Malaya—all dangle within Japan's reach. The moderates along with the Army recognize Japan's "golden opportunity." They are willing to assist the military in new Pacific ventures. In return, they ask an assurance against further regimentation of Big Business, against efforts to set up an Army dictatorship, against dangerously irresponsible aggression.

With Konoye at its head, the new party seems to offer such guarantees. Like its prototype in Italy, the party, now that under Konoye it has assumed control, can be expected to convert the parliament into a rubber-stamping assembly, ecstatically acclaiming each Government measure. But before reaching the Diet, each bill will pass Konoye's critical inspection. His is the task to see that the two rivals for power do not violate the terms of the union.

Konoye, it is true, is a disciple of Saionji and an opponent of military dictatorship. He feels that Big Business must have relative freedom to earn and expand. It would, however, be erroneous to regard him as a foe of the Army or of aggression. He sanctioned the North China invasion in 1937. If Japan can seize Occidental colonies in the Pacific without war with the United States, he will readily approve new conquests.

Moreover, the fighting services will not find him a very stubborn opponent. The new post represents to him the culmination of a meritorious political career. He will not risk its abrupt termination by challenging the Army's formidable strength.

The creation of the new party means Japan is streamlining her political machinery for new aggression. Konoye's job is to keep it in high gear.

Capitalist's Cooperative

Henry Jeffers, head of the dairy at Plainsboro, N. J., applies important methods to the production of milk

SIDNEY M. SHALETT

ONE fine spring day, when the fields were green and the cows were mooing gently, a Cornell professor of agriculture burst angrily into the office of the Walker-Gordon dairy at Plainsboro, N. J. This was more than twenty-five years ago; Henry William Jeffers, Cornell '99, was just starting his revolution in the dairy business. The professor, shaking his finger at his erstwhile star pupil, accused him of "breaking the backbone of America—the farm home—with your factory methods."

Another Cornell professor already had told Jeffers he was a little touched if he thought he could manage dairy cows in herds of more than thirty-five. Mr. Jeffers began to get a little annoyed. The criticisms created a coolness between him and his Alma Mater. Otherwise, they had no more effect on him than a pea-shooter on a tank. He went blithely ahead with what he was doing, and today he knows that he has been successful.

A somewhat paradoxical social and economic experiment is being staged today at Plainsboro, where Mr. Jeffers is ruler of the 2,700 acres, 126 structures, 300-odd "partners" and 1,500 head of cattle that constitute the Walker-Gordon dairy. (There are additional acres, buildings and cows at Juliustown, N. J., and Charles River, Mass.) It is, however, such a successful paradox that one wonders whether it will become a model for other comparable forms of Big Business. It is that strangest of corporative creatures—a "capitalistic cooperative," where the boss makes property-owners out of the lowliest employes and figures out their budgets for them when they want to get married.

The general conception of a cooperative does not square with what Mr. Jeffers, now 69 years old and a rugged individualist, is doing. Not only is he "capital" to the core—he even practices the fast-disappearing art of benevolent paternalism. But the Plainsboro farmers, who enjoy security, prosperity and cordiality with the boss—they call him "the Governor" or "the Old Man"—love it. The stockholders also are happy, and the great milk-consuming public is benefited as well.

Back in 1891, when the infant mortality rate was appallingly high, a leading Boston pediatrician got the idea that poor milk might be the poison that was killing scores of babies. He persuaded an idealistic cattle-breeder and a successful business man to form the Walker-Gordon Laboratory Company to experiment with modified milk for infants. By 1898, the fast-growing company, needing a manager for the small dairy it had established at Plainsboro, hired Henry Jeffers, then still a Cornell junior, at $35 a month.

Today, Walker-Gordon, which since 1929 has been a division of the Borden Company, is the largest certified milk farm in the world, and the former $35-a-month employe is its president and general manager. It centers at Plainsboro around Mr. Jeffers' most widely-known invention, the famous rotolactor, or "cow merry-go-round," a small-scale replica of which can be seen at the New York World's Fair. Mr. Jeffers, looking over the 1,500 cows and recalling the professorial warning against herds of more than thirty-five, likes to emphasize how big his dairy really is by pointing out that "the largest of the ordinary certified milk farms in the United States have herds of no more than 100 cows."

Few companies in the United States can make stronger claims to the performance of a public service. In its forty-nine years of existence, the company has pioneered in many of the important developments in the milk industry. It also has another claim to fame—the Jeffers system of administration, ownership and production—which Mr. Jeffers considers of equal importance. He describes it as an integrated cooperative, with centralized direction and decentralized operation. It has worked successfully on the Walker-Gordon dairy, and he is convinced that it could be applied to revolutionize every form of perishable-food production.

In appearance, Henry Jeffers, a short, plump, weather-beaten man, with an inevitable cigar in his mouth, could be a traveling salesman for farm machinery or the leading real-estate agent of any medium-sized town. He has an air of perpetual good humor, as if he had just heard good news. He can—and does—talk about farming as if it were pure poetry, but his conversation is apt to be confusing, for he bounces from subject to sub-

ject with bewildering agility. A question about the rotolactor is likely to bring an answer about soil and tree conservation. But, get the knack of following the man, and you perceive that he is a genuine idealist, with infectious enthusiasm and an exciting philosophy, and that he really is giving you a picture of something coherent and powerful in its potentialities.

THERE are other sides to the man. He can drive a hard business deal, his counsel is sought in State Republican politics and he is an adviser to educational commissions and banking boards. In his big stone house at Plainsboro, he has a celebrated basement hideaway called "The Cellar," where he entertains personages who come to look over the capitalistic cooperative. There he becomes the Country Squire and genial host. Over smooth New Jersey applejack, which he lovingly ages in his own kegs, he may entertain his guests with an account of his favorite ancestor, Great-Great-Granduncle Jim, who, he swears, was hanged as a pirate in 1831, or tell hilarious stories of how, through years of association with cows, he has come to understand "every word of their language." He drove a Borden designer almost to tears when he solemnly announced to the press that the recording which provided a sound accompaniment for the World's Fair rotolactor was not the contented moo of a happy cow but the mournful "goodbye" of one headed for the slaughterhouse.

His Plainsboro experiment has all the features of a "milk factory"—with one important exception on which the whole system hinges. Mr. Jeffers is firmly convinced that to copy the impersonal assembly-line features of an auto factory would destroy the human element of personal initiative and wreck his enterprise. So Walker-Gordon owns none of the milk cows at Plainsboro. Instead, "the Old Man" hand-picks college-trained men and gives them small jobs on the rotolactor. If they make good, the company sets them up as small herd-owners, giving them the necessary financial backing.

These new dairymen bring their cows into the system and abide by its strict standards. Instead of struggling to buy or raise feed or to pay veterinarian bills, like the average small farmer, they profit from the wholesale purchasing and production power of the big company, reaping the higher earnings that are made possible by its scientific research, efficient production and distribution. They work hard; if they shirk, they're cheating their own pocketbooks. Finally after a period of years, during which they and their families have enjoyed a high standard of living, they gradually pay off their debt to the company and emerge as sole owners of their valuable herds.

Henry Jeffers

The same principles are applied to crop farmers, who also are hand-picked and set up by Walker-Gordon to raise high-grade feed for the huge Plainsboro dairy.

At present, the system consists of eleven dairy unit—or herd—operators, four of whom also raise crops, and six operators who raise crops exclusively. The company also buys some feed from four nearby farms not in the system. One of these is operated by the Rockefeller Institute, which for years has worked closely with Walker-Gordon. All units are within a fifteen-mile radius of the rotolactor, but the men, not the cows, make the daily trip. The cows "board out" comfortably at the central barns, going home only to calve.

THERE also is a waiting list of about thirty leading farmers of the area—and this is one of the best arguments for the plan—who are anxious to bring their herds into the system. There is a good reason for this: Figuring conservatively, a Walker-Gordon dairy operator in an average good year will earn $5,000; a Walker-Gordon crop farmer $3,000. These figures are considerably higher than the average small farmer's earnings. Then, too, the Walker-Gordon dairy operator, coming in with nothing, has an opportunity in ten years to own $25,000 to $30,000 worth of cattle and equipment, while a land farmer in the system will be worth from $7,500 to $10,000—an extremely attractive prospect.

An outstanding Walker-Gordon farmer is Paul B. Bennetch, ambitious, intelligent and hard-working dairy unit operator. Bennetch, a Pennsylvania State Agricultural graduate, joined Walker-Gordon to help Mr. Jeffers work out his plan of unit operation, and himself became one of the first operators. Starting with little or no capi-

tal, Bennetch now has 125 to 150 cows, 75 to 100 head of young stock, mostly purebreds, and a complete line of equipment, worth altogether at least $25,000. He rents a 170-acre farm near the rotolactor on which he raises his own young stock and part of his feed. In addition to keeping up his sizeable business, employing four men and maintaining a comfortable home in nearby Langhorne, Pa., Bennetch cleared off $5,200 of his loan between December, 1936, and August, 1939.

There is no set pattern for Walker-Gordon operators. The books show instances where other men, who did not specialize in such expensive breeds or who were able to bring some private

resources into the business, have made even faster progress toward complete ownership. One farmer, for example, joined the system in February, 1935, had paid off $7,000 by April, 1937, and, by financing the rest of the deal with his own money, was owner of a 100-cow unit. Another cleared off $6,000 between March, 1935, and March, 1937. A third used private resources to retire a $10,000 loan almost immediately and now is earning from $5,000 to $6,000 a year as a crop and dairy operator. A fourth cut a $22,000 loan to $15,000 in eighteen months on his Walker-Gordon earnings.

Plainsboro, a pleasant little community near Princeton, about half-way between New York and Philadelphia, is indelibly stamped with the Jeffers' imprint. It governs itself on the old New England town meeting plan, which "the Old Man" insists is the "only way" for a town its size. It boasts a handsome stone church and a prize-winning schoolhouse besides the attractive houses of the Walker-Gordon operators and executives. These houses, handsome as many in fashionable sections of Long Island, are built by the Plainsboro Building and Loan Association, another Walker-Gordon baby. Mr. Jeffers, who is president of the Association, will sit down with a young operator who wants to get married and work out for him a budget permitting him to construct and pay for a house in ten years' time.

Walker-Gordon also has about a hundred employes who are not unit operators, while the unit operators themselves employ supervisors and "barn men." These employes are not neglected. There are neat frame houses, each with its own garden, which the salaried employe who is a family man may rent at from $8 to $25 a month. Unmarried employes live in a Walker-Gordon clubhouse, a sort of rural Y.M.C.A., where they get a comfortable room, three exceedingly square meals a day, medical attention and garage facilities for $30 a month. Since the average barn man earns $3.50 a day, and supervisors more, even the lowest-paid employe in the Jeffers system is not working entirely for the landlord, grocer and doctor.

SURROUNDED by the thirty-three barns, each accommodating fifty cows; the huge dehydration plant, where forage grasses are scientifically converted into "green hay"; the four 2,500-ton silos, said to be the largest dairy silos in the world, and the other plant buildings, is an imposing brick structure housing the heart of the dairy—the rotolactor. Though the idea of a cow merry-go-round may sound fanciful, there is no whimsy in the rotolactor plan. For efficiency and economy of operation, it is the answer to an efficiency expert's prayer, and, insofar as sanitation is concerned, it is a dream of perfection. As Alfred S. Cook, Rutgers dairy professor who quit the classroom to become Mr. Jeffers' first lieutenant, puts it: "You wouldn't expect a farmer to come out of the field into an operating room and perform a surgical operation. Well, at the rotolactor, we look on the drawing of milk as a surgical operation, and act accordingly."

The rotolactor is a 66-foot "magic circle," on which, for eighteen hours a day, constantly-changing loads of fifty cows revolve on a twelve and one-half minute ride. Three times a day, each cow saunters through an alleyway connecting her barn with the air-conditioned lactorium, where she gets a thorough scrubbing, a medical test and electrical milking as the rotolactor's moving platform carries her slowly on a full circle. More than 4,000 sterilized towels are used each day for drying the cows' udders before milking. The milk is destroyed and the animal is whisked to a hospital if she shows even the smallest sign of the slightest illness. A large medical department looks after the health of cows and humans, and a postmortem eventually is performed on every cow.

All this has produced milk in which the bacteria count per cubic centimeter runs from 7,000 to 8,000 lower than the 10,000 maximum set by law for certified milk.

Naturally, such super-milk has attracted fanatically faithful followers. In his memoirs, James W.

Gerard, United States Ambassador to Germany during the first World War, tells of an upper-class lady who absolutely refused to be evacuated until she could be guaranteed transport on a boat serving Walker-Gordon milk. At least one President and several millionaires religiously stock Walker-Gordon milk for long cruises.

THE company has done fascinating work in the research field. Since 1929, when Walker-Gordon, feeling need of a larger distribution system, became a subsidiary of the Borden Company, there have been obligations to the parent company, which must be discharged. Nevertheless, Mr. Jeffers has insisted on the principle that has been the backbone of the company from the beginning: namely, that profits over a reasonably low percentage be plowed back into research.

The history of dairying is studded with Walker-Gordon "firsts." It has not been selfish with its discoveries, but has made them available to Federal and state institutions, college research departments and the industry in general. Indeed, many of the health regulations adopted by various States were born at Plainsboro.

Walker-Gordon's "first-first" was a thing now commonplace—the closed-top milk pail. This innovation was installed at the time the company made its milkers wash their hands, wear clean overalls, scrub the cows and tidy up the stables. Elementary-sounding things now—but it must be remembered that back in the '90's cows were milked in manure-heaped barns by filthy-handed stablemen, and pails were open receptacles for flies and dirt.

The company followed through by establishing the first technical control laboratory to be operated in conjunction with a dairy—the little shack still stands as a sort of shrine on the Plainsboro lawn —and hired not only veterinarians for the cows but physicians to check the employes.

Next it began worrying about what to feed the cows and how to treat them to produce more nutritious milk. Old-fashioned farmers thought the company executives were crazy when they began giving their cows sun-baths, first outdoors, then under sunlamps. But Walker-Gordon soon progressed to putting irradiated yeast in the feed and the commercial development of Vitamin D milk resulted. How to get the anti-infective and growth-promotional Vitamin A into milk was another research problem. This led to development of the dehydration plant, making possible the production of a verdant hay with the nutritive qualities of fresh grass, and also to the important discovery that a molasses-and-grass mixture produces a grass silage that improves the quality and color of milk and cuts expensive grain bills.

Then there were discoveries of what to feed cows to make milk taste better; the first commercial production of acidophilus milk in conjunction with Yale University laboratories, where the process was developed, and many other end-products of research and enterprise.

Public interest in the Plainsboro experiment is indicated by the estimate that 150,000 persons a year visit the plant. Secretary of Agriculture Wallace and delegations from Europe and South America are among those who have studied the system. The Soviet Government once asked Mr. Jeffers to go to Russia and put a gigantic rotolactor under the Five-Year Plan. Some 7,743,000 persons saw the small rotolactor at the World's Fair in 1939, and millions more are seeing it this year. Mr. Jeffers has received inquiries about copying the system from such far-flung places as Venezuela, Argentina, South Africa, Australia, and Italy.

Today, at an age when most men have retired or are thinking about it, Henry Jeffers is getting ready to embark on a new phase of his career—expansion of his system. He has two ideas about this—one theoretical; the other practical. He believes that, in theory, his system of centralized management and decentralized ownership could be efficiently applied to any branch of farming because, while "the Lord never meant for broad acres to be farmed under the wage system," the small farmer simply cannot produce and market crops as efficiently as a big corporation. However, someone else must apply the Jeffers revolution to farming; "the Old Man" is too much occupied with dairying to expand in this direction.

HOWEVER, he knows that the system works in the dairy business, and he intends to prove to the world that an "integrated cooperative," centered around a rotolactor, is the best way to run a milk farm. When the 1940 Fair is over, he plans to take the exhibition rotolactor and install it either at the Juliustown plant, at the Charles River plant near Boston, or possibly at a new plant near Philadelphia. If the Borden Company, which controls the basic patents on the rotolactor, decides to permit it, rotolactors may be set up in South America. European possibilities, naturally, have been retarded by the war.

"The Old Man" is convinced that he could put certified milk on the market at present Grade A prices. His laboratory men are experimenting with a new form of pasteurization by quick cooling instead of heating—an adaptation of freezing methods that have been so successful with foods—which, if developed, would preserve the full flavor of unpasteurized certified milk. Another laboratory dream is to produce, at ordinary milk prices, a canned milk like fresh milk which can be kept indefinitely at room temperature.

A Mother's Plea

A deeply felt and moving anti-war plea by Mrs. Mathilda Burling, National President, American Gold Star Mothers of the World War

as told to

DOROTHY DUNBAR BROMLEY

I AM a mother who believed in America going into the last World War. I am a mother, one of 30,000 whose sons lie buried under crosses in France.

Our son was our only child. He was a boy everybody loved. He had a good job at sixteen; he had taught himself an electrician's trade. Then there was trouble on the Mexican border. Before his father and I knew it, Georgie had enlisted in the National Guard. He gave his age as twenty when he was only sixteen.

When he came back from the border we were about to go to war with Germany. Georgie told us he was going to enlist in the regular army and not wait to be sent with the National Guard. "I am not wearing this uniform for show," he said simply. His father and I thought him too young to go overseas. But it was no use. "If you don't give me your consent, mom and pop," he said, "I will change my name and go anyway, and then you won't know what unit I'm with." So we let him go.

One day, on February 13, 1918, I saw an army balloon flying low over our little house on Long Island. I could almost make out the faces of the balloonists and it seemed to me they had a message from Georgie. "I hope nothing has happened to our son," I prayed. Later the news came that he had died in a base hospital on that very day.

After that I threw myself into war work. I left my pots and pans on the stove and my chickens in the coop. I had only two things to comfort me.

Theodore Roosevelt, to whom I am related through marriage, wrote me shortly before his own son fell in France, "May the heavens be kind and tender toward you." And Georgie, after hearing of my Red Cross work, had written me not long before he was wounded, "If anything happens to me I will die peacefully because I will know you will carry on where I leave off."

So I worked harder than ever, serving soldier

boys in the canteen, knitting by lamplight, and selling Liberty Bonds.

Then we had peace and I carried on the work of the American Gold Star Mothers of the World War. Later, in 1924, I went to see Secretary of War Weeks. I begged him to have our boys' graves in France marked with marble crosses instead of perishable wooden cross-pieces. At first he did not understand why we mothers wanted crosses—why we would not be satisfied with small flat headstones.

"Mr. Secretary," I said, "is not the cross the symbol of sacrifice?" His own son, Secretary Weeks told me, had been in twenty-seven engagements and had been over the top nine times, but had happily come back alive. Now there were tears in his eyes, and he said, "You shall have your crosses, and we will mark the graves of the Jewish boys, if their families prefer, with the star of David."

I wonder how many people today remember those crosses in France, remember the great sacrifice those crosses symbolize. The boys who fell were pitifully young—most were eighteen, nineteen, or twenty years of age. They were too young to know what war was like. Too young to know how much of life they were giving up.

And who thinks today of the boys who came back insane, maimed, and crippled? Women who sat on their front porches knitting, and never went near the hospitals, did not know what war was. But I saw the horror of the boys who were raving mad in cages. I made myself look at the basket cases.

I CAN still see one boy with a beautiful face in an evacuation hospital in Staten Island. He had no arms or legs. He begged me not to let his mother know that he was still alive.

These are some of the sights which I cannot forget. Now, twenty-two years after our sons made the final sacrifice, Gold Star Mothers come to me and cry, "Mother Burling, do you believe my boy died in vain?"

If only I could honestly tell them their sons did not die in vain! But I cannot. I look at Europe today, sunk again in one of the wars they have been fighting for three hundred years. I hear talk all around me about our going to war once more to save the world for democracy. Even some ministers urge such a course—why, I cannot understand. They would talk differently if they had seen, as I did, American mothers kneeling at the graves of their sons in France.

It was God's will, we told ourselves then, that our sons should have been called upon to die for the peace of the world. That was in 1931 when we could still hope for peace.

Today how bitter is our disillusionment! The newspaper headlines might be copies of what was printed early in 1917. There is talk of universal military conscription, of a vast preparedness program. The President, it is true, has assured the American people that our youth shall not again be sent to die in a European war. But we Gold Star Mothers cannot forget that President Wilson was reelected on the platform, "He kept us out of war."

Many Gold Star mothers are now grandmothers. Others have younger sons born in war-time with a prayer in the mother's heart that this son might live to ripe manhood and comfort her in her old age. But we speak not for ourselves alone. We plead for the peace of soul of those millions of American mothers who have as yet had no cause to tremble at the sight of an unopened telegram in their hands.

We women of America love America. We will help defend our country. We will give our sons and menfolk to defend it should it be attacked. But we are aware that Chief of Staff General Marshall said not long ago that he did not apprehend an invasion of our shores. So why, we ask—and women, everyone knows, are the supreme realists—should we go to war abroad in the name of democracy, when, by the very act of fighting a totalitarian nation, we should have to resign ourselves to a regimentation which would be fascism under an American name?

IT will be too late when war has been declared. Too late when your son comes to you, as mine did, and says simply, "Mother, I am going." It is we women who create young life, we women who wait at home. So I say to you mothers, you wives and future wives, raise your voices.

No war, remember, was ever fought without the support of women. Our sex has the numbers—if we will summon the courage—to turn back the tide of war hysteria which is rapidly sweeping over the country. We must write our Congressmen, we must write the President, we must form organizations in every community. If we would save our menfolk we women must act and act quickly.

The Forum Quiz

Compiled by

FREDRIK DeCOSTE

South America has become such an important consideration in the problems now facing the United States that we have decided to devote the whole quiz to our sister republics. Count 2 points for each question—and good luck! The test is quite hard and a score of 70 in this case would be perfect. Answers will be found on Page 60.

What do *you* know about the other America? One, two, . . begin!

1. The country between Peru and Colombia is:
(a) Bolivia *(b) Ecuador* *(c) Chile* *(d) Amazonia*

2. Most everyone speaks Portuguese in:
(1) Paraguay *(2) Brazil* *(3) Venezuela*

3. *One* of these statements is *false:*
We get most of our coffee from Brazil.
The potato was first found in Peru.
Tierra del Fuego (Land of Fire) is tropical.
The Amazon is longer than the Mississippi.

4. Before the Panama Canal was built ships circumnavigated South America by way of:
(Cape Horn) (Cape Hatteras) (Cape of Good Hope)

5. What is the name of the Brazilian "torch" singer who was recently so well received in New York City?

6. What are:
(1) llamas *(2) llanos* *(3) pampas*

7. Thornton Wilder once wrote a book about Peru called ————.

8. The long and desperate Chaco war was fought between:
(Paraguay-Uruguay) *(Paraguay-Bolivia)* *(Bolivia-Argentina)*

9. *One* of *these* statements is *true:*
Colombian cowboys are known as Gauchos.
Development of synthetic nitrates during the World War was a terrible economic blow to Chile.
The Orinoco empties into Lake Titicaca.
Buenos Aires is the capital of Brazil.

10. Which three European powers have colonial possessions in South America?

11. The Incan civilization *(did) (did not)* extend farther west than what is now Peru.

12. Is it true that:
General San Martin once marched an army over the Andes?
Most of the Amazon jungle belongs to Venezuela?
The world's biggest copper mine is in Chile?

13. Our radio broadcasts to South America are outclassed by those of:
(Russia) *(Italy)* *(Germany)?*

14. What two metals essential for producing steels used in battleships are mined in Bolivia and Peru?

15. What is the Pan American Union?

16. The world's largest snake farm is in what city near Rio?

17. What group of Ecuadorean islands in the Pacific would make a strategic military base?

18. Which of these are right (x) and which are wrong (-)?
The Andes are higher than the Rockies.
Argentina is the world's largest exporter of beef.
Paraguay and Uruguay are bordering countries.
By ABC Powers *is meant Argentina, Brazil, and Colombia.*

19. The little Andean animal whose fur has furnished a few $30,000 coats for ladies is the ————.

20. The southernmost city in the world is ————, Chile.

21. What now decadent city on the Amazon river was once a glittering rendezvous for opera singers and jungle adventurers?

22. ———— is often referred to as the "Paris of South America."

23. Can you match these correctly:
Little Venice..................Valdivia
The City of Kings.............Sucre
Capital of Bolivia..............Lima
German city in Chile..........Venezuela
Matto Grosso..................Ecuador
Andean country...............Brazil

24. Which South American country suffered a disastrous earthquake in February of 1938?

25. Panama hats are not made in Panama but in ————.

26. The 8th regular Pan American Conference was held in ————.

27. Santiago, capital of Chile, is only (2) (4) (6) (8) days by plane from Miami.

28. Cocaine derives its name from the Bolivian plant ————.

29. The Jivaro Indians of the Ecuadorean jungle are famed for what infamous practice?

30. What Chilean island in the Pacific is the storied "Robinson Crusoe" isle?

31. Recently (12) (18) (20) (23) South American republics accepted an invitation from the U.S. to an emergency conference.

32. Which of the following South American Presidents made a speech which was interpreted as favorable to totalitarian powers? *Ortiz, Contreras, Vargas, Cerda, Santos.*

33. Does Nicaragua lie north or south of the Panama Canal?

34. Speaking of the Canal, at which end is the city of Cristobal?

35. Off what city and in the waters of what country was the *Graf Spee* scuttled?

QUOTATIONS FROM THE WORLD PRESS

If the Worst Comes . . .

—Condensed from an article by Rebecca West, British novelist and critic, in Time & Tide, *London*

If the worst comes to the worst, and the Germans invade England, many of us will be hurt and some of us will be killed. We will see other people, possibly those whom we love, being hurt and being killed. Our homes may be destroyed, and towns which are dear to us, and woods and fields which are the fond background of our lives, may be horribly annulled. We may know fire as a pursuing enemy and hunger and thirst as our companions, so well that sudden death becomes a friend. Well, it might be far worse.

It would be much worse, to take one possibility, if we behaved badly. We all of us are bound to feel fear during the next few weeks. Anybody who did not would be defective, as defective as the politicians who did not become alarmed by the aggression of Nazi Germany. It is a wholesome reaction. When the bowel finds that it is harbouring an irritant, it uses every muscle in its wall to expel it, and the result is colic. When the mind becomes aware that it is faced with a dangerous experience, it floods the consciousness with a disagreeable sensation, designed to warn it that it will perish if it does not organize all its resources in self-defense. Do not be ashamed of your fear. Cherish it, obey it to the point of thinking quickly and acting vigorously in the interests of your safety. But conceal it.

Conceal your fear. Act on it, get the fire-hose and the sand-buckets ready, clear the attic. But do not express it in the disagreeable form in which it came to you. For fear and pain have one important characteristic in common. Their outward and visible signs give onlookers an exaggerated impression of what the person who is ill or is afraid is suffering. Anyone who has undergone pain so severe that it has to show itself in cries and movements knows that these often overstate the degree of discomfort that is actually felt. The body is calling for help, so it makes the appeal as strongly as possible. Amateur and inexperienced nurses are constantly deceived by this overstatement into believing that their patients are being subjected to a strain greater than they can bear.

Fear, like pain, looks and sounds worse than it feels. When one is afraid of being killed in an air-raid or by a parachutist, there are all sorts of considerations which our mind checks up on the other side. There is the sporting chance we all enjoy of not being hit, the hope that somehow we may be able to perform some act of disservice to the enemy, the knowledge that the military operations of which these raids will be a part should end in a victory for England and freedom from Hitler. But fear, like pain, is an appeal made for an urgent purpose. It, too, is always an overstatement.

Therefore you should not speak the words it puts into your mouth, or let it decide the expression of your face. For there will be no experienced nurses about you to know that you are not in such a bad case as you seem. We are all novices in this situation, even our governors. Therefore we might, if our code did not include the most rigid stoicism, contrive for ourselves a ruin which is worse than any pain we might suffer in warfare. If we say, "We cannot bear the torture of waiting day after day for the bombs to drop on us", or "We cannot bear having bombs dropped on us day after day because we are afraid of being killed", and if we say it again and again with the bogus poignancy of fear, it is possible that the government might hear us and believe us. They might form the mistaken view that it was impossible to go on waging war when the civil population was in such a demoralized condition. They might then feel obliged to make terms with the Germans.

This would not mean peace. It would, indeed, mean that we should never know peace again, and that our children and our children's children should not see its return. Our young men would be taken from us to fight Germany's imbecile wars of aggression against Russia, America, Africa, and Asia, and when they came back to us they would have been trained in such delicate arts as machine-gunning civilian refugees. The rest of us would be forced to give our labour and every penny more than was needed for our bare subsistence to pay for these imbecile wars. And the background of our lives would be the fear of the concentration camp; and we would never again warm our hands at the fires of kindness and tolerance. Those of us who know Nazi Germany know that it is darkness; but we would dwell in the outer darkness which

is the lot of the Czechs and the Poles today. Let us, therefore, bridle our fear and give the government full opportunity to win the war.

The Dutch East Indies — and Japan

—Reprinted from The Orient Pictorial, *published by Tokyo Asa hi Shimbun*

Japan's relations with the Netherlands Indies date back more than 300 years. It is only during the past ten years, however, that the economic ties between the two peoples have been most intimate. Since 1932 the Japanese have been supplying the bulk of the colony's imports and taking an important share of its exports. A great part of the commerce is in textiles, such as cotton and rayon fabrics, amounting to more than 53,000,000 yen a year. In 1934 Japan sold to the islands huge quantities of the so-called light export goods, including more than 3,000,000 bicycles. In return it has bought enormous amounts of oil, sugar, rubber, scrap iron, ivory and tin. At one time the total trade in one year amounted to 850,000,000 yen. Although the Japanese have not the immense capital investment in the colony's industries that the Dutch, Chinese, British and Americans have, they have more than 80,000,000 yen invested in rubber cultivation, nearly 40,000,000 yen in mining, and an increasing share in oil production. Japanese financial interests jointly produce oil with Dutch interests in Java.

Of the total population of some 60,000,000 the Japanese population is insignificant. There are only 7,000 residing in the Dutch East Indies, compared to 1,200,000 Chinese overseas merchants and some 50,000 Europeans and Americans. Approximately 80 per cent of the Japanese are engaged in small businesses. The merchants deal in textiles and miscellaneous goods. The large banks of Japan have branches throughout the islands and there are also 500 Japanese barber shops, photographic salons and restaurants, while about 1,000 engage in fishing and an equal number operate or work on Japanese or Dutch coffee, rubber, sugar and rice plantations. The number of Japanese immigrants to the islands is restricted to 800 a year. Contrary to expectations, the Japanese have not migrated there in large numbers and the population remains stationary. As in other countries the Japanese have proved themselves law-abiding, industrial and loyal to the country they have migrated to.

Great significance must be attached to the fact that as soon as the Nazis invaded Holland, the Japanese cooperated wholeheartedly with the Dutch colonial authorities in extending relief to Holland. Japanese at Djokja, Brebes, Batavia and other centers united in their efforts to collect relief funds, putting a handsome part of their earnings at the disposal of relief workers. Future relations appear bright at this time of writing. The Government has stressed that there will be no change in the status quo whatever and that it is fully prepared to make good its assurances. The Dutch guilder remains steady owing to the favorable position of the colony which is in a position to promote commerce in the Pacific. Shipping and trade with the Japanese Empire are expected to be increased.

(At par the Japanese yen is equal to 84.4 cents.)

Ballad for Americans — The Smash-Hit Cantata

—Condensed from an article by Douglas Gilbert in The New York World-Telegram

Just when the song publishers had everything neatly grooved, along come John Latouche and Earl Robinson, and toss all their categories into Seventh Ave. with *Ballad for Americans*—a cantata.

Ballad for Americans violates every sacred principle of popular song writing: No blue sky, no love nest, no June moon, no waterfall, no baby-makes-three. It hasn't much tune, it is difficult to sing, its historical references are accurate and it takes 13 minutes to —so they used to say—render it.

Now since Paul Robeson and Lawrence Tibbett sang it on the air nearly every high school and college in America has bought it; clubs and civic organizations are learning it, and to get the Victor album of four sides as recorded by Mr. Robeson, you enroll your child before birth.

In fact, so great has been the response to the song, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer has just purchased it at the reputed sum of $4000 for film use.

Mr. Latouche calls the song a "pamphlet for democracy" and is dismayed at some public comment that it is a George Cohan flag-waver.

The "song," a chant with antiphonal choral responses and occasional spoken lines, is difficult to characterize. It is written in the vernacular and presents the soloist as a composite American type of all races, creeds and activities. It traces the development of the United States from the Revolution through our Western expansion to the machine age and ends with a Whitmanesque exhortation.

The protagonist asserts that he is a "teacher, beauty specialist, bartender, mechanic," etc. "All of them," he sings. "I am the et ceteras and the and so forths that do the work."

Voice—Hold on there, what are you trying to give us?

Second voice — Are you an American?

Solo—Am I an American? I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French-and-English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek-and-Turk, and Czech and double Czech American!

Voice—Holy mackerel! (Chorus: whistle of amazement).

Solo—And that ain't all. I was baptized Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Atheist,

Roman Catholic, Orthodox Jewish, Presbyterian, Seventh Day Adventist, Mormon, Quaker, Christian Scientist—and lots more. [Copyright 1940, Robbins Music Corporation]

The boys (Latouche, unmarried, is 23; Robinson, married, 29) are as grateful for their success as they are astonished at its repercussions.

Both of the boys have been around for five or six years but never got much further than the socially significant stage and the WPA-Federal theater. The idea for the song occurred to both at the same time. Mr. Robinson, an actor and musician from Seattle and a graduate of the University of Washington, had sketched out the music for such a piece and was looking for a lyric writer when he met Mr. Latouche who, it appears, was looking for a song writer.

They married their talents and the song, first called *Ballad for Uncle Sam,* was given in an abridged form in *Sing for Your Supper,* the show that rehearsed eighteen months and proved the epitaph of the Federal theater. The boys then redressed it and sold it to the Robbins Music Corporation, which published the song.

Mr. Latouche, a native of Richmond, said he was moved to write his words after watching the inroads of the Silver Shirts in Virginia.

Coming to New York he entered Columbia University and wrote the college show, and several of his numbers were used later in the American Music Hall. His success with the Columbia show drew him into the theater.

Fitzpatrick—St Louis Post-Dispatch

Europe's Armageddon

Germany vs. Britain — Continental Viewpoints

Virginio Gayda, Mussolini's spokesman, in The Giornale d' Italia, *a newspaper of Rome:* Britain will have to choose between submission to the new forces of Europe or a very hard and violent war, taking not the weeks and years of which Churchill spoke, but days and hours. Churchill speaks in vain of defeating universal values. Britain remains alone.

Germany has untouchable superiority in air forces and offensive means. With the war booty obtained in France, Holland and Belgium, she is supplied for a long war.

The blockade has proved a boomerang to England, while the British domination of the seas daily appears more inconsistent. The defense of the British Isles is in all ways more difficult, in view of the great number of the British forces engaged by the Italian Navy, Army and Air Force in the Mediterranean and Africa. All the British imperial system, including the Pacific and Indian Oceans, is isolated and seriously menaced.

The Svenska Dagbladet, *a newspaper, of Stockholm, Sweden:* There must be a middle way between a British catastrophe and a German triumph. A mortal German-British struggle must in the end destroy irreplaceable cultural values and weaken the entire political and economic position of all Europe to such an extent as to endanger the world political leadership of the white race. Such an outcome would serve neither Germany nor Britain even if London should for a moment be speculating on Stalin's growing fear of a victorious Germany.

Many an outside observer finds the moment has come for mediation.

The Hamburger Fremdenblatt, *a newspaper, of Hamburg, Germany:* The present fateful hour has brought on a crisis in the British ruling class — a crisis which may spell the end of the Eton boy. It has made the merry old England of the powerful landed proprietors and influential clubs a thing of the past. Criticism of this or that political personality, which characterizes the political scene in England during this hour of despair, is an expression of social ferment which threatens to devour the traditional system of rulership of the city man from Eton.

This upper crust of Britain is now in the final stage of its exit from the scene of world history which it ruled for several centuries. Its fall will only be the

result of its own errors and omissions. These men were wholly incapable of recognizing National Socialism as the dawn of a new era in relationships between men and nations.

The Eton boys misunderstood their role in modern times, because, occupied exclusively with the thought of destroying the party of the British worker, they were equipped least of all for the coming world political battle with social revolution on the European Continent. Today they are being presented with a bill for their folly in England itself. It was possible for Winston Churchill, most undependable of all Conservative politicians, to take the helm of the ship of State only because the inner circle of the city of richer families thought thereby to parry the seething discontent of the working masses.

Actually, however, the men who hold the moneybags and the privileges, men like Neville Chamberlain, Sir John Simon and Lord Halifax, are still retained in power. As to how long they hold it—that is another question.

A. Golubeff in Bolshevik, *a newspaper of Moscow, U.S.S.R.:* We are unaware of the real plans of the British Government. But if Britain is really determined to fight to a victorious end then, relying upon her geographical position, the tremendous power of her naval forces and the exceptionally powerful financial and economic resources of the British metropolis, dominions and colonies, she may maintain a long, stubborn resistance.

The landing of armed forces on the British Isles represents, even for the powerful German Army, an exceptionally difficult operation. This perhaps is still the only real means under which Britain might be forced to capitulate unless the struggle ends in some compromise. That is why the war may continue for a long time and assume completely new forms.

Stranger in Paris

—Reprinted from an editorial in The New York Sun

A stranger visiting Paris the other day did as many other sightseers do. He ascended the Eiffel Tower. He visited the Church of St. Mary Magdalen. He went to the Hotel des Invalides to stand pensively at the tomb of Napoleon. From the tower he could observe of Paris what crusty old Field Marshal von Bluecher once observed of London and say with him: "Was fuer Plunder!" At the Madeleine he may have lingered before Larche's fine statue of Joan of Arc, or before the painting of Napoleon receiving an imperial crown from the hand of Pope Pius VII. It is to be surmised that on this day the famous organ, if playing at all, was playing a Miserere, not a Te Deum. Or perhaps, with their usual foresight, the Germans had brought a special organist along with them.

Upon the sightseer's call at the Invalides imagination naturally prefers to dwell. No visitor, however dull or stupid—this one was anything but dull and stupid—has ever been able to look down upon that great sarcophagus without a stirring of emotion. Among many who have endeavored to put their feelings into words was an American, Robert G. Ingersoll, more or less noted a generation ago, who said:

> I would rather have been a French peasant and worn wooden shoes. I would rather have lived in a hut with a vine growing over the door and the grapes growing purple in the kisses of the autumn sun. I would rather have been that poor peasant with my loving wife by my side, knitting as the day died out of the sky, with my children upon my knee and their arms about me. I would rather have been that man and gone down into the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust than to have been that imperial impersonation of force and murder known as Napoleon the Great.

Imagination must balk at a suggestion of any such sentimental animadversion on the part of this present sightseer. It could be said more truly of him than of any other man since the Corsican's time that he, too, is an imperial impersonation of force and murder. A few days before he had stood at Boulogne, as Napoleon once stood there, and frowned toward the cliffs of England. As Napoleon once said—in Ralph Waldo Emerson's phrase—"There shall be no more Alps!" so this man had said "There are no more islands!" Whether he had carried the Corsican's philosophy still further there is no way of knowing. Napoleon is credited with a saying that there are but two powers in the world, the sword and the mind; that in the long run the mind always beats the sword. If the stranger knew of this, it might well have served him as a theme for meditation. The very environment could have given him another theme also. It might have told him that conquerors ultimately molder away in tombs, but that human affirmations of liberty, fraternity and equality are immortal. The sightseer was Adolf Hitler.

A German View of Our Military Power

—Condensed from an article in the Frankfurter Zeitung, *Frankfurt, Germany*

One needs only to glance at the front pages of newspapers in the United States to learn which themes are agitating Americans. All American observers, be they professional politicians or newspapermen, industrialists or workers, soldiers or civilians, agree that German arms and German tactics have pushed aside all traditional conceptions of modern warfare; that every well-armed country must now reorganize its military system from the bottom up. The armaments of armies and fleets must be modernized according to lessons learned on the battlefields of Europe. In the United States, where everyone had been convinced that the European War would not touch American policies, President Roosevelt has made himself the spokesman of the requirements which the American people now regard as indispensable.

Not only the pro-English groups, especially in the newspapers of the northeastern states, see in the lessons of the war a task for the United States which must be executed immediately and to its fullest extent. The perfect agreement of all circles of the American people with Roosevelt's armament program shows that, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, everyone believes that the old conceptions of power are being revolutionized. This makes Americans feel the importance of the President's words, according to which the American continent

should become increasingly invulnerable.

The motives which move the American nation and the government cannot change the facts on which American foreign policy is based. These facts consist of ideological and geographical realities. Until the outbreak of the World War, the United States followed a foreign policy which, protected by the two wide oceans, confined itself to the gradual intensification of relations between the North and South American continents. The World War taught the United States that, if they want to maintain their role as a world power, they must regard the two oceans as an outfield of their immediate interests. Furthermore, South America must be looked upon as an expansion of the national space of America's foreign policy. At the same time the military side of America's foreign policy gained new perspectives.

The Treaty of Washington, the real victory of the World War, gave the Americans, as well as the British, supremacy over the Japanese fleet (the ratio 5:3). The cooperation between the United States and those parts of the British Empire within the American sphere of power—Canada and Australia—formed a link between the two Anglo-Saxon world powers. This cooperation showed that the British Empire and its politico-military might had become more a function than a guarantor of American security. To safeguard its interests in the Pacific and in the Far East, America could rely upon its own fleet and upon cooperation with Britain. In the Atlantic, America did not need a powerful navy, as it felt itself protected by the supremacy of the British fleet. Thus, America could limit itself to the defense of the Panama Canal.

It is clear that this foreign policy was based upon the superiority of the fleet compared to other arms of sea warfare. But just this picture of the invulnerability of the navy—which is only a reflection of the invulnerability of the country protected by such a navy—has been rudely upset by the successes of the German air arm over the British fleet. All thoughts of these colossuses of steel on the

Herblock, NEA

Umbrella Road

ocean are accompanied by doubts of the supremacy of this weapon. The conclusions drawn by Americans are based on results in the air in European battles. To this must be added the importance of tanks in battles on the ground.

While the speed of planes has opened undreamed of possibilities for this weapon, the protective power which long distances offered has disappeared. Therefore, American foreign policy, in which great distances play a decisive role, has felt obliged to pay special attention to the air arm. The political combinations which Washington connects with rearmament have been clearly shown in the problems which the army and navy are being given to solve during maneuvers. While the Pacific fleet this year for the first time has advanced far into the southwestern part of the Pacific Ocean; the army, which will hold its maneuvers during August in the northeast of the country, will be entrusted with the task of defending New York against an attack by motorized units coming from the St. Lawrence River.

If this shows nothing else, it shows the important fact on which the American policy of rearmament is based: The continents have been brought closer together.

A Flight-Lieutenant—What He Feels on a Raid

—Condensed from an article in The Listener, *London*

Starting off on a raid, the most significant thing is what's happening inside you—the changed feeling you have toward the other pilots. You haven't taken much interest in these pilots before. But suddenly you're going into something that you haven't gone into before, and you're all thrown together. You suddenly realize that

you have known these chaps for a hell of a long time, and you think: "He's not a bad chap after all," and then you all get together and say: "Here we go, chaps!"

You have a funny feeling in the tummy—like a lot of snakes moving up and down—wondering what is going to happen. Everybody does. The person who doesn't feel these things isn't human. It's the unknown that is getting you down. The moment you are in the air, it is different altogether. You feel as though you *are* something. You are strong. You are in this aeroplane, and it's part of you, and it's not really something that is governed by anybody else, or somebody above you.

Now you are all in formation, and it's a thrilling sight to look over the formation and see the planes coming along. You can almost see the expression on the chaps' faces—everybody coming along and cracking over the sea —miles from anywhere—nothing but damn water. You listen carefully to your engine—very carefully. One of my motors started to splutter and cough. The feeling I got was "Blast this confounded engine. I won't get there now. I'm going to miss the fun." It's not a frightened feeling until you are out of it—until you see them going on and you can't join them, and you say: "Well, here we are in this mess, what are we going to do?" And when it picked up again —well, I can't describe the jubilation as I charged off and rejoined the formation.

We go into formation to attack. Then there's one second just before you crack into it, when everything is a blank, and the next moment you are in it. There is gun fire, and pom-poms, and you are in it and you are not yourself. You feel as if "It just can't be me! I'll wake up in a moment." And then you feel the clatter of the guns underneath you. You feel them firing away, and you see what damage you are doing. And you swoop again, and as you swoop you wonder if they are going to get you. You can see the bullets coming up, and you think, "Are they hitting me?" and you move about and see if you *can* still move.

You look down at the damage you have done, and you see the men charging and running about, and the crews working on the flying boats, and people in the hangars —people running engines up, and preparing to come across. And you can see flying boats smoking. It's a satisfaction you can't feel unless you have really done it.

Then you scatter for home— very low down right on to the water. You are off very fast, and you look again for all the fellows, you can't see somebody, and you say: "Gosh, what's happened to him?"—and then you see him on your left or on your right and then you join up together and fly home.

It's getting dark. You can't see a thing—not a thing. Probably it's a bad night—it's raining. It's like being in a coal cellar—everything is pitch black. You are watching your instruments; there is no light — just the phosphorescence on your wind-screen — no lights anywhere.

The perspiration pours off your hands. It's cold as anything, but it's concentration on your instruments the whole time.

And then you see a good old English searchlight coming into the clouds, and you say: "God, I'm home!" And it doesn't matter what happens now! It doesn't matter if the engines fail now. Suddenly you see the flare light for your arrival. All the chaps are in. You have hit your objective and you have got back to your base, without even going round the country! Very good navigation!

Personally I got out into the fresh air and lay on the wings for a quarter-of-an-hour—just drinking in fresh air. The jubilation is terrific. You can just hear the crackle of the exhausts as they are cooling down after being red hot. You just lie and listen to this, and there's nothing except men walking about. Everything is quiet and lovely and peaceful.

Well—you have seen people for what they are, doing their stuff, every one of them. And a relation existed then which exists at no other time. You have a feeling for everybody.

Are You Partly Crazy?

—Condensed from an article by S. E. Rogers in The Newsletter, *San Francisco*

The answer, undoubtedly, is yes; especially in these days of hysterical concentration on the developments in Europe.

An expert psychologist tells us that recently he has been walking the streets of San Francisco, engaged in an obscure mission. He "clocked" every person whom he passed, or with whom he engaged in conversation (man or woman), who revealed, by walk, action, facial characteristic or comment any evidence of a disordered personality. His "clock" showed 32 per cent. It is claimed this percentage would be higher in Los Angeles, due to the presence of motion picture people and so many immigrants from Iowa and Wisconsin.

This was the "once over." The psychologist says that a fifteen minute conversation with the others would disclose that at least 18 per cent of the total are "tipped" to one side in some reflex, making at least 50 per cent somewhat "off".

In one large organization, employing about three thousand people, a careful check-up by trained psychologists revealed that approximately 20 per cent of the employes had serious personality handicaps, so severe in many cases as to be rated a disordered personality. Let us not think for a moment that the crazy cross section of society are all among the "common run" of people, as President Coolidge used to call us. Fully as high a percentage of known "nuts" are found among the wellborn and the high-born.

Two and perhaps three of our Presidents have so deteriorated during their second terms as to be considered mentally unhinged. The publisher of the great *London Daily Mail* died hopelessly mad, and many of our nationally known leaders in commerce and industry —not to mention literature, law, politics—died "under a cloud."

If you are partially crazy—and you probably are—don't let it get you down. Just reflect that you have a lot of distinguished company, and, if you do not talk too much, you may keep it to yourself, and others may never suspect you.

Black Starr

All Quiet on the American Front?

THIS hemisphere is still free from the inferno that hit Europe in 1914 and again in 1939. How long will it last?

For fifty years the American republics have been developing a code to stand the pull and strain of economic rivalry and nationalistic jealousies. They believe those issues can be settled without bloody preliminaries on the battlefield.

Occasionally, the American republics have fallen from grace. But on the whole, they have been moving steadily toward peaceful cooperation. During this march of progress, we began to take things for granted. Now, we have awakened to the fact that the problems of inter-American peace and collaboration have by no means been solved.

How long can we have quiet on the American front? Can we afford to leave it to chance and good intentions? We don't think so. We believe that you, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, can do something about it. Let's find out what our Latin American neighbors intend to do about it, and tell them we're ready to go along with them.

World Peaceways has a program for building that cooperative inter-American action. Do you intend to remain on the side-lines, or to do your share toward keeping this hemisphere the world's stronghold of civilization and peace?

•

Do something about it now. Write today to WORLD PEACEWAYS, 103 Park Avenue, New York City.

Chronology of the European War

JUNE 21—In the presence of Adolf Hitler, Germany's terms for an armistice are read to the French delegates in the historic railroad car in the Forest of Compiegne, scene of Germany's surrender in 1918.
—President Roosevelt invites other countries to participate in plans for a gigantic export corporation to control all Western Hemisphere exports.

JUNE 22—The Armistice between France and Germany is signed in the Forest of Compiegne. The French delegates, headed by General Charles Huntziger, leave immediately for Rome to negotiate an armistice with the Italian government.
—British bombers pound the famous Krupp armament works at Essen.
—From London General Charles de Gaulle broadcasts an appeal to the French people to continue the fight against Germany.

JUNE 23—Britain withdraws recognition from the Petain government of France saying it can no longer be regarded "as the government of an independent country."
—In London General de Gaulle proclaims the formation of a French National Committee to continue the fight against Nazi Germany.
—French and Italian plenipotentiaries meet in Rome to negotiate an armistice.

JUNE 24—Italo-French armistice is signed in Rome. Six hours later the "cease fire" order is given on all fronts.
—Clashes between Russian and Rumanian troops on the Bessarabia line are reported by Hungary.

JUNE 25—France observes a day of national mourning with flags at half-mast and buildings draped.
—In the House of Commons Prime Minister Churchill bitterly denounces the French government for violation of its pledge to deliver its fighting ships to British ports before armistice negotiations were started.

JUNE 26—British troops supported by warships and bombing planes raid the German-occupied French coast.
—Reports from Bucharest indicate that Germany and Italy have reached an agreement on the division of the Balkans into spheres of influence.
—London hears that powerful units of the French fleet have fled to North African ports for a "fight to the finish."

JUNE 27—King Carol of Rumania yields to Soviet demands for the return to Russia of Bessarabia, the province in Rumania's northeast.
—London hears reports of German troop transport concentrations in French, Belgian and Netherland ports.
—President Roosevelt signs a proclamation controlling the movements of foreign or American ships in domestic waters and the Panama Canal area.

JUNE 28—Marshal Italo Balbo, Governor-General of Libya, is killed when his plane crashes in flames at Tobruk, Libya.
—German bombers raid the Channel Islands off the French coast.

JUNE 29—Berlin warns North and South American republics that a hostile attitude on their part will result in a "self-security" program for the new Europe.
—Foreign Minister Arita of Japan proclaims an Oriental Monroe Doctrine and warns the western powers against any move to upset the status quo in East Asia.

JUNE 30—Bucharest reports sharp clashes between Russian and Rumanian troops on the Bessarabian border.
—In a world-wide broadcast aimed at demolishing persistent peace rumors, former Prime Minister Chamberlain pledges Britain to continue the fight against the enemy "until he or we are utterly destroyed."

JULY 1—German bombers make daylight air raids over Britain.
—Rumania renounces Britain's guarantee of territorial integrity, and throws in her fate with Germany.
—Following the death of Marshal Balbo, Marshal Graziani, Chief of Staff of the Italian army, becomes Commander of all Italian armed forces in North Africa.
—Contracts for the building of forty-four warships and one non-combatant naval vessel are signed in Washington.

JULY 2—British bombers raid the Kiel navy base while relays of German planes range far and wide over England.
—President Roosevelt places a virtual embargo on the sale abroad of munitions or materials needed for American defense.
—Rumania sends troops to her Hungarian and Bulgarian borders to protect them against rumored invasion.

JULY 3—The British navy forcibly takes control of French naval ships in British ports. Some units are reported resisting.
—The British ship, *Arandora Star*, en route to Canada, with German and Italian prisoners, is torpedoed by a German submarine.
—The French liner *Champlain* strikes a mine off the coast near Bordeaux, and sinks.

JULY 4—In the House of Commons Prime Minister Churchill expresses sorrow that self-preservation has forced the British navy to turn its guns on several units of the French fleet at Oran, Algeria, to keep them from falling into German or Italian hands. Most of the French war vessels were destroyed, only one, the *Strasbourg*, managing to slip out of the harbor. French losses in men are said to be heavy.
—Through Ambassador Bullitt, Marshal Petain's government makes an indignant protest against the British naval attack, apparently in the hope that President Roosevelt will intervene to prevent any similar occurrence.
—King Carol of Rumania sets up a pro-axis, anti-Semitic regime.

JULY 5—The Petain government breaks off diplomatic relations with Britain over the Oran naval battle.
—Former Premier Laval is chosen to frame a new Constitution to give France "an ultra-modern version of democracy."
—Twenty Nazi bombers raid the British naval base of Portland.
—A new test of the "neutrality belt" looms as British warships blockade the French island of Martinique in the West Indies, where a French aircraft carrier is in harbor.
—Secretary of State Cordell Hull reiterates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine as Germany rejects the U.S. warning to keep hands off the Western Hemisphere.

JULY 6—British planes bomb the crippled French battleship *Dunkerque* which was run ashore, heavily damaged, in the naval action off Oran.
—Chancellor Hitler returns in triumph to Berlin.
—Five U.S. destroyers are sent to the French island of Martinique to observe the reported British blockade.
—At Hyde Park President Roosevelt again warns non-American nations to stay out of this hemisphere.

JULY 7—Adolf Hitler and Count Ciano, Italy's Foreign Minister, confer in Berlin. Following the conference Count Ciano leaves for a tour of the occupied territories.
—French air squadrons join Italo-German squadrons in attacks on Gibraltar.

JULY 8—Despatches from Vichy and Berlin indicate that French leaders plan to scrap the French democratic Constitution and substitute a totalitarian dictatorship under Marshal Petain.
—German bombers reach a new height of daylight activity over Britain. The R.A.F. retaliates by extensive raids into Germany.
—In answer to a petition from members of the German-dominated Norwegian Parliament King Haakon refuses to abdicate his throne.

JULY 9—The French Chamber of Deputies meeting at Vichy votes its own death sentence and gives the Petain government full power to establish a new Constitution.
—The British Admiralty announces a naval engagement between British and Italian squadrons somewhere in the Mediterranean, and claims that the Italians were forced to retire.
—While the French battleship *Richelieu* is put out of action by a daring British naval operation at Dakar, French and

Letters

(Continued from page 9)

authors impress me as being superior to the ordinary. "History in the Making," "They Say," and "Chronology" are surely neat ways of organizing material and imparting historical perspective.

ROGERS CROSBY.
NEWARK, N. J.

To the Editors:
I thought I would read a while before going to bed last night (until I became sleepy) and picked up CURRENT HISTORY & FORUM which had just come. But after reading for an hour I was so stimulated I couldn't sleep for another couple of hours.

MRS. C. G. BOTT.
SEATTLE, WASH.

To the Editors:
I have read Mr. Straus' article carefully, and I can think of no worthwhile additions or deletions to suggest. Mr. Straus has summarized the situation with respect to national defense housing and has clearly demonstrated the part which such housing can play in the general program of social betterment which is envisaged by the slum clearance program.

There is no question but that this *(Continued on page 62)*

British naval authorities at Alexandria, Egypt, reach an agreement by which French ships in that port will be demilitarized for the duration of the war.

JULY 10—The biggest air battle of the war is fought out between British and German airmen over Britain's Channel coast, as Nazi bombers attack a convoy.
—Pledging that "we will not send men to take part in European wars," President Roosevelt asks Congress for an additional $4,848,171,957 for defense purposes.
—In a stormy session at Vichy determined supporters of democracy force the Petain-Laval government to insert a provision for a national referendum on the new totalitarian dictatorship.

JULY 11—In reply to reports of attempted Nazi intimidation of Central American delegates to the Pan-American Conference at Havana, Secretary Hull warns that such tactics are a violation of the sovereignty of free nations.
—Barely twenty-four hours after the Third Republic is voted out of existence, Marshal Henri Petain assumes full powers as dictator of France.

JULY 12—Marshal Petain's government issues a decree automatically eliminating Jews from government positions.
—In an effort to appease Japan Britain is said to have offered to halt for three months the transport of arms to China over the Burma Road.

JULY 13—Rome claims that continuous Italian Air Force attacks against British naval units in the Mediterranean have split the British fleet into three sections.
—In response to German pressure Rumania demobilizes units of peasant soldiers, and sends them home to the wheat fields.

JULY 14—In a world-wide radio speech Prime Minister Churchill asserts that Britain will fight on "even if London is in ashes" and hints at a long war, with Britain taking the offensive in 1942.
—Bastille Day is observed in France as a day of mourning, while in London General de Gaulle, leader of the continued French resistance reviews remnants of the French army and navy who have thrown in with the British.

JULY 15—Italian planes bomb the new industrial area of Haifa, in Palestine's first air raid of the war.
—London hears that the British have agreed to close the Burma road to supplies for China during three months.

JULY 16—Rome reports that the Axis Powers will offer England an ultimatum.
—Britain's agreement with Japan to close the Burma road to supplies for China brings emphatic disapproval from Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

JULY 17—General Francisco Franco voices a demand for the return of Gibraltar to Spain.
—The Anglo-Japanese agreement to close the Burma road to China provokes angry debate in the House of Commons.

THE FORUM QUIZ ANSWERS

(Answers from page 50)

1. Ecuador
2. Brazil
3. Tierra del Fuego is far south of the tropic zone. Cold.
4. Cape Horn
5. Carmen Miranda
6. *(1)* Cameloid beast of burden common in the Andes
   (2) Prairies of Venezuela
   (3) Plains of Argentina
7. The Bridge of San Luis Rey
8. Paraguay-Bolivia
9. Synthetic nitrates knocked Chile's finances flat
10. England, Holland, France: the Guianas
11. Did not, for that way lay the Pacific Ocean
12. Yes, Argentina to Chile.
    No, to Brazil.
    Yes, Chuquicamata
13. Germany
14. Wolfram and vanadium
15. An organization supported by the 21 American republics for the development of friendly intercourse and commerce
16. Sao Paulo (St. Paul) Brazil
17. The Galapagos
18. Andes are much higher than Rockies.
    Argentina exports 70% world's beef.
    A slice of Argentina separates Paraguay-Uruguay
    Argentina, Brazil, Chile
19. Chinchilla
20. Magallanes (Spanish for Magellan)
21. Manaos, Brazil
22. Buenos Aires
23. Little Venice............Venezuela
    The City of Kings.......Lima
    Capital of Bolivia.......Sucre
    German city in Chile...Valdivia
    Matto Grosso...........Brazil
    Andean country.........Ecuador
24. Chile
25. Ecuador
26. Lima, Peru
27. Four
28. Coca
29. Reducing decapitated heads
30. Juan Fernandez
31. Twenty
32. Vargas
33. North
34. Atlantic end
35. Montevideo, Uruguay

Letters

(Continued from page 60)

country has sufficient resources in productive capacity to provide an adequate national defense and a proper housing program without having the one interfere with the other.

To a novice in political economy, it is a mystery why there should be so much emphasis placed upon the dollar value of things. Whether or not the country can afford a certain thing resolves itself into a question of whether or not there is sufficient national productive capacity to provide that thing. The number of dollars involved would appear to be a matter of bookkeeping. It has been generally conceded that during the depression years there have been an average of not less than 10,000,000 people unemployed. Let us assume that many of these 10,000,000 are not capable of fully productive employment, and that the general average represents about half of the average productive capacity of the populace. On this basis the wasted productive capacity of 10,000,000 men unemployed is worth something on the order of $15,000,000 per day, or about $4,500,000,000 a year. What this productive capacity, if properly directed, would do for the national defense, for slum clearance, and for a multitude of other worthwhile objectives can be easily seen.

It is not generally recognized that the totalitarian countries have succeeded in making use of a greater portion of their productive capacities than have the democracies. It has been frequently stated that there has been no unemployment in Germany since Hitler rose to power. That is no doubt correct if we are to believe the statements that labor has been imported into Germany from surrounding countries.

The point of the foregoing is that it is utterly futile to make comparisons between what can be accomplished by spending money for armaments and what can be accomplished by spending money for dwellings, amusement parks, highways, schools, water works, cosmetics, and what have you. This country has sufficient productive capacity to provide in abundance all of the things which we need. But, first, we must assure ourselves and our posterity that they will be able to enjoy those things in peace. That means an adequate national defense. By proper distribution of the country's productive capacity we can assure not only the benefits of modern science to all of our people, but the peace and security essential for their enjoyment.

Let us not think too much about the dollar value of things and let us think more in terms of productive capacity. For years we have been deluded into complacency by the fellow who said that the "European coun-

tries could not go to war because they had no money". The fallacy of such an argument is now patent, and since the argument is fallacious let us put that fallacy to constructive use by applying its lesson to our own problems in this country.

Let us not be drawn into futile discussions as to whether it is more important to have breakfast or dinner. Most people require both and this country can afford both. The important thing is to have plenty to eat.

B. MOREELL,
Rear Admiral (CEC), U.S.N.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

(The opinions or assertions contained herein are the private ones of the writer and are not to be construed as official or as representing the opinions of the Naval service at large.)

To the Editors:

I wish I were financially able to send a copy of your July issue to every legislator, and other official, having to do with forming our policies, that they might read the article "War Imperils America" by Douglas Johnson.

JOHN DEMAINAY.
VALDOSTA, GA.

To the Editors:

I live in a small village and have no opportunity of going to a city. I must have a good daily paper, the best available, so I take *The New York Times,* and CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM. My friends often say, "How do you know so much about all that is going on all over the world?" I tell them that my reading material is the best I can buy.

I cannot speak too highly of CURRENT HISTORY AND FORUM. Any man or woman reading it today need not be ashamed of his lack of understanding of world events.

Great success to your new magazine, and best wishes.

CHARLOTTE BAGLEY.
BEEBE PLAINS, VT.

To the Editors:

I have been a reader and subscriber to *Forum,* and have enjoyed it very much. In fact, although many magazines are available in my waiting room, it seems that my copy of *Forum* was always worn out from use quicker than any others.

My July copy of CURRENT HISTORY & FORUM arrived today, and while I have not completely read it yet, I have glanced through it, and will read every word in it during the next day or two. From my glance through, I believe that I will like it.

I did read your "Announcement to Subscribers," and was very favorably impressed with your promise to continue to present problems of daily life, and articles on controversial subjects.

OSCAR R. GLASS, D.O.
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

To the Editors:

I was naturally very much interested in the article, "This Won't Hurt Much," by Marguerite Clark.

Her discussion tells the story of Modern Medicine's conquest of pain in such a way that it is for the layman, at the same time, entertaining and informative reading. She shows a knowledge of the subject that is factual and "professional".

The new magazine is a splendid expression of authoritative opinion on current topics.

I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to voice my approval.

WM. MCKEE GERMAN, M.D.,
Director of Pathological Laboratories,
Good Samaritan Hospital.
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Index and Table of Contents

VOLUME LI—SEPTEMBER, 1939—AUGUST, 1940

A

ADAMS, James Truslow, Civilization Cannot Die, July 25
ADLER, Lawrence, Travel, Nov. 68
AIR Power vs. Sea Power, June 20
ALMAZAN, Mexican Caballero, April 37
ALLEN, E. Dangaix, Ghandhi Balks Again, Dec. 25
ALLEN, Robert S., Wheeler and the Liberals, March 25
AMERICA and the War, Oct. 35; Radio: Covering the Crisis, Oct. 35; Washington: America & Neutrality, Oct. 39; Can and Should America Stay Out of War?, Oct. 42; American Business and the War, Nov. 26; Our New Arms Program, Jan. 33; American Eagles in the Air, June 32; American Air Power, June 32; Arms for America, July 16; War Imperils America, July 45
AMERICA: Toward the American Dream, Dec. 41; American Politics in High Gear, Jan. 28; The National Pocketbook, Feb. 13; Uncle Sam Counts Noses, Feb. 36; American School of the Air, April 40
ANESTHETICS, July 34
ANUSKEWICZ, Major Benjamin T., Relief for Poland, June 40
ARLISS, George, A Londoner Looks at Hollywood, March 39
ARMS, Jan. 33
ARTS and the War, Jan. 42
AS the War Begins, Oct. 30
ASIA Draws Its Sword, Feb. 17

B

BAGLEY, Dr. William C., American School of the Air, April 40
BANKS Go Democratic, The, July 42
BARKLEY, Frederick R., Martin Dies of Texas, Dec. 29
BARTLETT, Vernon, This Is Our Strength, Aug. 23
BASEBALL, May 41
BATA at Belcamp, May 33
BATTER Up, May 41
BEALS, Carleton, Latin America & the War, Jan. 25
BECHDOLT, Frederick R., July 31
BESSENYEY, Gabor de, May 18
BOOK Forum, July 6, Aug. 4
BOOKS, Sept. 1, Oct. 1, Nov. 1, Dec. 1, Jan. 1, Feb. 1, March 1, April 1, May 1, June 1, July 1, Aug. 1
BRECKINRIDGE, Col. Henry, May 13
BRIDGES, Styles, June 38
BRITAIN'S Fleet Our Shield, Aug. 20
BROMLEY, Dorothy Dunbar, A Mother's Plea, Aug. 48
BUDGET, May 21
BUREAUCRACY Rules the Navy, March 30
BUSINESS, Sept. 50, Nov. 29, Business Faces the Forties, Jan. 39

C

CALIFORNIA, Oct. 58
CANADA, What Will America Do About, June 35
CANCER, The Conquest of, April 33
CANDIDATES, 1940's, Aug. 16
CAN Hitler Invade America? Dec. 13
CAPITALIST'S Cooperative, Aug. 44
CHAIN of Broken Promises, A, Nov. 14
CHAMBERLIN, Jo Hubbard, Forum Quiz, July 49
CHAMBERLIN, William Henry, Asia Draws Its Sword, Feb. 17
CHIANG Kai-shek, Mme., China Unbowed, April 31
CHILDS, Marquis W., Sweden: Her Tragic Dilemma, April 16
CHINA: Meng Chiang, The New Nation, Nov. 31; China Unbowed, April 31
CHINESE Are Like That, The, Sept. 21
CHRISTMAS Books for 1939, Dec. 1
CHRONOLOGY, Oct. 12, Nov. 55, Dec. 52, Jan. 55, Feb. 55, March 55, April 58, May 54, June 56, July 58, August 58
CITY Government, Sept. 19
CIVILIAN Can Take It, The, March 33
CIVILIZATION Cannot Die, July 25
CLAPPER, Raymond, Oct. 39
CLARK, Marguerite, This Won't Hurt Much, July 34
COLE, Hugh M., May 15; Hitler Invades Scandinavia, May 15
COLLINS, Edward H., American Business and the War, Nov. 29
COMMONWEALTH and Southern, Wendell Willkie of the, Feb. 21
CONGRESS Passes a Bill, March 19
COUSINS, Norman, Books, Sept. 1, Oct. 1, Nov. 1, Dec. 1, Jan. 1, Feb. 1, March 1, April 1, May 1, June 1, July 1, Aug. 1
COVERING the Crisis, Oct. 35
CROW, Carl, The Chinese Are Like That, Sept. 21

D

DALADIER, Premier of France, Jan. 19
DARK Messiah, The, Aug. 29
DAVIS, Shelby Cullom, Dec. 41
DEAN, Vera Micheles, Stalin in Europe: The Balkans, Nov. 15
DEBATE, Dr. Frederick L. Schuman vs. Norman Thomas, July 27
DE COSTE, Fredrik, Forum Quiz, Aug. 50
DEFENSE: Our New Arms Program, Jan. 33, American Eagles in the Air, June 32; Arms for America, July 16; Defense of England, Aug. 23; Mobilizing U. S. Man Power, Aug. 30; Machine Tools for Defense, Aug. 37
DENNY, George V., Sept. 45, Oct. 42, Nov. 38, Dec. 44, Jan. 31, Feb. 39, March 42, April 46, May 50, June 42, July 27
DEWEY, Thomas E., of New York, Jan. 35
DEWEY, Thomas E., The Runaway Budget, May 21
DIES, Martin of Texas, Dec. 29
DIMNET, Abbe Ernest, France Makes Up Her Mind, Dec. 15
DOES England Expect Us to Fight? Dec. 18
DUFFIELD, Marcus, Hitler's Germany, Oct. 12
DUPUY, Major R. Ernest, Our Arms Program, Jan. 33.

E

ECONOMIC War, Oct. 25
ELY, Richard T., The War Behind the War, Oct. 25
EMBATTLED DARKNESS, July 23
ENGLAND: Does England Expect Us to Fight? Dec. 18
ENTERTAINMENT, Sept. 52
EUROPE, The Future of, Jan. 13
EUROPE'S Cockpit, A Plan for, May 18

F

F. D. R. Must Run Again, July 20
FINANCE, Nov. 21, Feb. 13
FORUM Quiz, July 49, Aug. 50
FRANCE Goes to War, Nov. 22; France Makes Up Her Mind, Dec. 15; Daladier, Premier of France, Jan. 19; France at War, June 13
FRANKLIN, Jay, Congress Passes a Bill, March 19
FRIENDS at Work, May 37
FROM Garbage to Good Government, Sept. 19

G

GALLUP, Dr. George, Polling Public Opinion, Feb. 23
GANDHI Balks Again, Dec. 25
GAYN, Mark, Japan to Strike, Aug. 40
GERMAN Army and Monarchy, Feb. 27
GERMAN Olympic Games, Aug. 29
GENERAL Electric's New Chairman, Jan. 10
GOLD Star Mother, A Mother's Plea, Aug. 48
GREAT Britain's Ironside, April 21
GREENLAND, Nazis in, May 13

GUNTHER, John, Daladier, Premier of France, Jan. 13

H

HAMILTON, Gordon, G. E.'s New Chairman, Jan. 10; Wendell Willkie of C. & S., Feb. 21; Mrs. Smith Goes to Chicadelphia, May 31
HARD, William, Jr., From Garbage to Good Government, Sept. 19
HAWAII, March 36; Hawaii States Her Case, July 40
HENDERSON, Alfred, Bats at Belcamp, May 33
HENRY, Thomas P., Mr. Motorist Speaks Out, Oct. 53
HIGH Command, The, Oct. 28
HILL, Frank Ernest, Democracy Rules the Airwaves, Feb. 33
HIMMLER, Hitler's, June 28
HISTORY in the Making, Sept. 7, Oct. 6, Nov. 6, Dec. 7, Jan. 7, Feb. 6, March 10, April 6, May 6, June 6, July 9, Aug. 10
HITLER: Hitler's Germany, Nov. 12; Can Hitler Invade America, Dec. 18; Hitler Invades Scandinavia, May 15; Hitler's Himmler, June 28
HIXSON, Fred, "Cord" Hull: Tennessee Statesman, May 24
HOLLAND Looks to Her Dikes, April 19
HOLLYWOOD: Hollywood Sets the Style, Nov. 35; A Londoner Looks at Hollywood, March 39
HOUSING Does Its Part, July 37
HUGHES, Rupert, Thomas E. Dewey of New York, Jan. 35
HULL, "Cord": Tennessee Statesman, May 24
HUNGARIAN Goose Step, Sept. 29

I

INTERNATIONAL Law, The Reality of, April 13
IRONSIDE, Great Britain's, April 21
ISSUES In 1940, The, May 23
ITALY: Is Italy Winning the War? March 21; Italy's Theater of War, June 25

J

JACKSON, Lon, Our Billion Dollar Rock, March 36
JAPAN: The Problem of Japanese Trade, Dec. 49; The Sino-Japanese Front, Jan. 22; Japan to Strike, Aug. 40
JESSUP, Philip C., The Reality of International Law, April 13
JOHNSON, Brig. Gen. Hugh S., Can Hitler Invade America? Dec. 18
JOHNSON, Douglas, War Imperils America, July 45
JOHNSON, Thomas M., As the War Begins, Oct. 30
JUDD, Lawrence M., Hawaii States Her Case, July 40
JUNIOR Statesmen of America, July 31

K

KELTY, William H., Keynoter Stassen, June 37
KEYNOTER Stassen, June 37
KNEPPER, Max, Scrambled Eggs in California, Oct. 58

L

LASKI, Harold J., Qualifications for Presidency, May 28
LATIN America and the War, Jan. 25
LETTERS to the Editor, Aug. 7
LET'S Listen to Swing, Aug. 25
LONDONER Looks at Hollywood, A, March 39
LORE, Ludwig, Europe Completes a Cycle, Oct. 21

M

MACCORMAC, JOHN, What Will America Do About Canada, June 35
MACHINE Tools for Defense, Aug. 37
MAIER, Howard, The Banks Go Democratic, July 42
MARCOSSON, Isaac F., The Conquest of Cancer, April 33
MARTIN Dies of Texas, Dec. 29
MATHESON, Walker, Meng Chiang, The New Nation, Nov. 31
MATSON, Clarence H., The Problem of Japanese Trade, Dec. 49
MENG Chiang, The New Nation, Nov. 31
MEXICO, April 37
MILITARY: As the War Begins, Oct. 30; Military Strategy and Tactics, Jan. 16
MILLER, James, Moses, Idealist in Action, Sept. 26
MOTORIST Speaks Out, Mr., Oct. 53
MOLOTOV, Jan. 12
MONARCHY and the German Army, Feb. 27
MOSES, Idealist in Action, Sept. 26
MOTHER'S Plea, A, Aug. 48
MR. MOTORIST Speaks Out, Oct. 53
MURPHY, Thomas E., Rhode Island's Vanderbilt, Oct. 50
MUSSER, R. H., Saving the Soil, April 43

N

N.L.R.B. on the Carpet, Feb. 30
NASON, Major Leonard, Jan. 16
NATIONAL Pocket Book, The, Feb. 13
NAVY, The, March 30
NEVINS, Allan, The National Pocket Book, Feb. 13
NINETEEN-Forty's Candidates, Aug. 16
NORWAY: Fortunate Disaster, June 15
NOTES and Documents, On Record, Oct. 15, Nov. 50, Dec. 55, Feb. 63

O

O'LAUGHLIN, Colonel John Callan, Sea Power vs. Air Power, June 20
ON Record, Notes and Documents, Oct. 15, Nov. 50, Dec. 55, Feb. 53
OUR American Defenses, Nov. 26
OUR Billion Dollar Rock, March 36
OUR New Arms Program, Jan. 33

P

PEACE, Ten Points for World, March 16
PERSONALITIES in the War, Oct. 21
PHILIPPINES, Sept. 31
PLAN For Europe's Cockpit, A, May 18
POISON Gas Terror Over Europe, June 28
POLAND, Relief for, June 40
POLITICS: Political War, Oct. 21; American Politics in High Gear, Jan. 28
POLLING Public Opinion, Feb. 23
PORTER, E. F., Yellow Peril, April 28
POSTAL, Bernard, The Civilian Can Take It, March 33
POUND, Arthur, Friends at Work, May 37
PRATT, Fletcher, Our American Defenses, Nov. 26
PRESIDENCY, Spotlight on the, The Runaway Budget, May 21; The Issue in 1940, May 23; "Cord" Hull: Tennessee Statesman, May 24; Qualifications for the Presidency, May 28; Mrs. Smith Goes to Chicadelphia, May 31; The Third Term, June 38; F.D.R. Must Run Again, July 20; 1940's Candidates, Aug. 16
PROBLEM Child of the Pacific, Sept. 31
PROBLEM of Japanese Trade, The, Dec. 29

Q

QUAKERS, May 37
QUALIFICATIONS for the Presidency, May 28
QUIZ, The Forum, July 49, Aug. 50

R

RADIO: Covering the Crisis, Oct. 35, April 40
RAPER, Charles L., The St. Lawrence Waterway, March 28
REALITY of International Law, April 13
RED Cross and the War, The, Dec. 58
REED, Philip Dunham, Jan. 10
RELIEF for Poland, June 40
RHODE ISLAND'S Vanderbilt, Oct. 50
RIBBENTROP: Hitler's Oracle, Dec. 23
ROGERS, Lindsay, American Politics in High Gear, Jan. 28; 1940's Candidates, Aug. 16
RUSSIA'S Molotov, Jan. 12

S

SACHAR, Dr. Abram L., B'nai B'rith, April 24
SAINT Lawrence Waterway, The, March 28
SCANDINAVIA, Hitler Invades, May 15
SCHUMAN, Dr. Frederick L., A Debate, July 27
SCHUYLER, Jack, Poison Gas: Terror Over Europe, June 28
SCIENCE, Sept. 51
SCRAMBLED Eggs in California, Oct. 58
SCULLY, Michael, Almazan, Mexican Caballero, April 37
SEA Power vs. Air Power, June 20
SHALETT, Sidney M., Capitalist's Cooperative, Aug. 44
SHEEAN, Vincent, The Future of Europe, Jan. 13; France at War, June 13; Embattled Darkness, July 23
SINO-Japanese Front, The, Jan. 22
SMITH, Mrs., Goes to Chicadelphia, May 31
SMYTH, Joseph Hilton, Hungarian Goose Step, Sept. 29
SPARLING, Earl, Let's Listen to Swing, Aug. 25
STALIN in Europe: The Balkans, Nov. 15; The Baltic, Nov. 19
STARK, Louis, N.L.R.B. on the Carpet, Feb. 30
STASSEN, Keynoter, June 37
STILWELL, Clifford, S., Machine Tools for Defense, Aug. 37
STIRLING, Admiral Yates, March 30
STRATEGY? Military and Tactics, Jan. 16
STRAUSZ-HUPE, Robert, France Goes to War, Nov. 22; Russia's Molotov, Jan. 12; Monarchy and the German Army, Feb. 27; Great Britain's Ironside, April 21; Mobilizing U.S. Man Power, Aug. 30
SULLIVAN, Mark, A Chain of Broken Promises, Nov. 14
SWEDEN: Her Tragic Dilemma, April 16
SWING, Raymond Gram, Aug. 25

T

TACTICS, Military Strategy and, Jan. 16
TAFT, Robert A., The Issues in 1940, May 23
TALBOT, Commander Melvin, Britain's Fleet Our Shield, Aug. 20
TANKS Are Coming, The, Dec. 21
TAXES, Oct. 58
TEN Important Books of Non-Fiction in 1939, Jan. 1
TEN Points for World Peace, March 16
TENNESSEE Statesman, "Cord" Hull, May 24
TEXAS, Martin Dies of, Dec. 29
THEY SAY, Sept. 36, Oct. 61, Nov. 63, Dec. 31, Jan. 46, Feb. 44, March 47, April 49, May 43, June 46, July 51, Aug. 51
THIRD Term, The, June 38
THIS Won't Hurt Much, July 34
THIS Is Our Strength, Aug. 23
THOMAS E. Dewey of New York, Jan. 35
THOMAS, Norman, A Debate, July 27
TOWARD the American Dream, Dec. 41
TOWN HALL Essay Contest, Feb. 43, March 46
TRAVEL, Sept. 56, Oct. 61, Nov. 63, Feb. 61, March 61

U

UNCLE SAM Counts Noses, Feb. 36
UNITED States Gold, April 28

V

VAN ALEN, Eleanor, The Book Forum, July 6, Aug. 4
VANDERBILT, Rhode Island's, Oct. 50
VANDERBREGGAN, Cornelius, Jr., April 19
VAN LOON, Hendrik Willem, The War and the Arts, Jan. 42
VAUGHN, Miles, The Sino-Japanese Front, Jan. 22
VIDMER, Richards, Batter Up! May 41

W

WALKER, Basil C., Norway: Fortunate Disaster, June 15; Arms for America, July 16
WALKER, Gordon Dairy, Aug. 44
WALTON, Sydney G., Travel, Oct. 61
WAR: Chronology of the War, Oct. 12, Nov. 55, Dec. 52, Jan. 55, Feb. 55, March 55, April 58, May 54, June 56, July 58, Aug. 58; Political: Europe Completes a Cycle, Oct. 21; Economic: The War Behind the War, Oct. 25; Personalities: The High Command, Oct. 28; Military: As the War Begins, Oct. 30; Red Cross and the War, Dec. 58; Latin America and the War, Jan. 25; War and the Arts, Jan. 42; Great Britain's Ironside, April 21; Nazis in Greenland, May 13; Hitler Invades Scandinavia! May 15; A Plan for Europe's Cockpit, May 18; France at War, June 13; Norway: Fortunate Disaster, June 15; Sea Power vs. Air Power, June 20; Embattled Darkness, July 23; War Imperils America, July 45
WASHINGTON: America and Neutrality, Oct. 39
WELLS, H. G., Ten Points for World Peace, March 16
WHARTON, Don, The Tanks Are Coming, Dec. 21; American Eagles in the Air, June 32
WHAT Will America Do About Canada? July 35
WHAT'S YOUR OPINION? Sept. 45, Oct. 42, Nov. 38, Dec. 44, Feb. 39, March 42, April 46, May 50, June 42, July 27
WHEELER and the Liberals, March 25
WILLISON, George F., Uncle Sam Counts Noses, Feb. 36
WILLKIE, Wendell, of C&S, Feb. 21
WILL Women Lose Their Jobs? Sept. 14
WOLFE, Henry C., Stalin in Europe: The Baltic, Nov. 19; Ribbentrop: Hitler's Oracle, Dec. 23; Is Italy Winning the War? March 21; Italy's Theater of War, June 25
WOLFE, Thomas, Dark Messiah, Aug. 29
WOMEN, Will Women Lose Their Jobs? Sept. 14

Y

YELLOW Peril, April 28
YOUTH Crusade, July 31

Attention Librarians

●

Below is the schedule by which your unexpired subscription to FORUM *has been extended. The old* FORUM *expiration-month is in the left-hand column; the new expiration-month for* CURRENT HISTORY *and* FORUM *is in the right-hand column.*

July 1940	August
August	Sept.
Sept.	Oct.
Oct.	Nov.
Nov.	January 1941
Dec.	Feb.
January 1941	March
Feb.	May
March	June
April	July
May	Sept.
June	Oct.
July	Nov.
August	January 1942
Sept.	Feb.
Oct.	March
Nov.	May
Dec.	June

If your library had subscribed to *both* FORUM and CURRENT HISTORY, you can obtain the new, extended expiration-month for CURRENT HISTORY and FORUM by adding to the above, right-hand (FORUM extension) month, the number of months until your CURRENT HISTORY subscription would have expired. *All* duplicated subscriptions have been extended in this way.

Printed in the U.S.A.

(Continued on other side)